THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4. JULY 1929. Vol. XIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

CIENCE VERSUS CREEDS.

The New Physics has been industriously exploited in the terests of obscurantism. In view of this we welcome a recent terance of Professor Eddington's in his Swarthmore Lecture r 1929 (*Science and the Unseen World*: Allen and Unwin, 6). Here he says that men of science have more use for the eker, than for those who say they have found:

'Finding has a clamorous voice that proclaims its own importance; it is definite and assured, something that we can take hold of—that is what we all want, or think we want. Yet how transitory it all proves. The finding of one generation will not serve for the next. It tarnishes rapidly except it be preserved with an ever-renewed spirit of seeking.'

The Quakers, before whom this lecture was delivered, claim be Seekers, and decline to embody their faith in any creed formula. And it is interesting to observe that they are the ristian body which is the least involved in the discredit at esent resting on all churches.

'Religious creeds,' says Dr. Eddington, 'are a great obstacle to any full sympathy between the outlook of the scientist and the outlook which religion is so often supposed to require . . . I think it may be said that Quakerism, in dispensing with creeds, holds out a hand to the scientist. The scientific objection is not merely to particular creeds which assert in outworn phraseology beliefs which are either no longer held or no longer convey inspiration to life. The spirit of seeking which animates us refuses to regard any kind of creed as its goal.'

Of course it is customary to say that apart from creeds there n be no convictions. This, however, is by no means the case.

'Rejection of creed is not inconsistent with being possessed by a living belief. We have no creed in science, but we are not lukewarm

> in our beliefs. The belief is not that all the knowledge of the universe that we hold so enthusiastically will survive in the letter; but a sureness that we are on the road . . . So too in religion we are repelled by that confident theological doctrine which has settled for all generations just how the spiritual world is worked . . . Religion for the conscientious seeker is not all a matter of doubt and self-questionings. There is a kind of sureness which is very different from cocksureness.'

It is not the least interesting feature of the present situation that though men of science are many of them adopting an attitude highly sympathetic towards religion, they find themselves quite unable to subscribe, not merely to the orthodox creeds, but to any creed whatsoever—unless of a provisional kind. The theologians will doubtless say that this reluctance is due to spiritual pride. It may be so. Perhaps it makes no difference what you call things, since they remain what they are.

An Outspoken Sermon.

Preaching in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, June 9th, the Bishop of Birmingham gave expression to thoughts which seem to us no less appropriate to the present situation than those of Dr. Eddington.

> 'There is a widespread desire,' said Dr. Barnes, 'to establish through closer human unity the Kingdom of God, a Kingdom on earth, compact of material things for spiritual ends. But, while such desire is strong, meagre respect is paid to old orthodoxies. I see few signs that institutional religion is rapidly decaying: but little attention is paid to the formal utterances of its official spokesmen, and traditional beliefs which have not passed into oblivion are often regarded with impatience. In fact, the elaborate dogmatic systems of the past have broken down. Even those who profess to cling to them ignore much that was once deemed vital. And the mass of thoughtful men and women to whom religion is a matter of deep concern think anxiously of a few main principles and are satisfied if they can make a simple framework for the emotional faith by which they are upheld and inspired.'

Dr. Barnes holds, what we believe to be true, that it is to the men of science that we owe 'this present movement towards simplicity and even austerity in religious belief.' And it is a notable fact that when students of science discuss the philosophico-religious aspects of their knowledge, they 'receive an attention denied to official divines.' For many, the attraction of science undoubtedly is that it is progressive; and 'men turn to science because they believe scientific leaders to be honest

uides, free from the temptations of orthodoxy.' It is occa-onally more than a little hard for 'official divines' to avoid ıe appearance of special pleading.

Meanwhile, the chief product of the scientific way of look-ıg at things is 'an increasingly widespread disbelief in miracle.' 'he issue between theology and science now is 'between the niformity postulated by natural science and the miracles of ıe New Testament'; and those Churchmen who have felt the ıfluence of scientific method 'find miracle no aid to faith.' 'hey hold that 'the spiritual authority of Jesus must be spiritu-lly discerned: it cannot be substantiated by proof that He had xceptional power to control nature or to heal disease.'

Dr. Barnes points out that many of the younger clergy, 'hatever their elders may do or say, realize the situation. 'They re not prepared to deny, but they regard themselves as under o obligation to defend, the miraculous records of the New 'estament. Such controversy, they feel, is best ignored in rder that the main work of religious revival may be done.'

And while on the subject of the younger clergy, the Bishop f Birmingham does not hesitate (this behaviour is rare among ishops in this connection) to speak the truth. He reminds us f the real reason of the decline in quantity and quality of rdinands.

> 'Unfortunately the Church is widely thought still to demand beliefs incompatible with the outlook created by scientific progress. Though able boys of every social class can now reach the Universities, very few indeed take Holy Orders. Often they have social enthusiasms: within them normally is the sober religious spirit of our race: but enthusiasm and religious aspiration do not lead to the Christian ministry. I would that some change might appear. We are often told that there is no dearth of candidates for Holy Orders. But unfortunately many of those who now come forward are inadequate alike in mental capacity and in *morale*. Some wish social advancement: they should be rejected. Others have the lamentable confidence which the seminary produces. Too many men ordained during and since the war cloak ignorance and inefficiency beneath an extravagant sacerdotalism. Such men are a weakness alike to the Church and to the cause of Christian progress . . . I would urge that we cannot be content until more of the best of our young men enter the ministry of our Church. To remove misunderstanding we need constantly to explain that, while old standards of belief have crumbled, no new orthodoxy has been officially set forth. A young man, enthusiastic for all the new knowledge of our age, can to-day without dissimulation or hypocrisy become an Anglican clergyman. A group of such men would have a golden opportunity of useful service.'

APPOINTMENT OF BISHOPS.

It is not at all unnatural that utterances such as the abov should cause misgiving among devout persons. And we ca imagine that the return to power of the Prime Minister to whon we owe the appointment of Dr. Barnes, has caused a certai nervousness; for if our episcopate included even half a doze members of this type, revolutionary results might be expected Under these circumstances it is certainly providential that committee of distinguished clerics and laymen of the Church o England, which has for the last six years been considering th question of the Appointment of Bishops, should have publishe its proposals at this psychological moment.

The Committee, of which the Bishop of Manchester (Dr Guy Warman) is chairman and the Archbishop of York one o the members, has reported to the Church Assembly that th immediate minimum necessities of the situation require th imposition of checks on the power of Prime Ministers and th Crown. They urge that the Church should be safeguarde against the possibility of abuses, and that an amendment of th present methods is needful for the preservation of the Church' self-respect.

They propose, therefore, (1) that the electing body shoul have the right to refuse to elect the person named in the King' Letter Missive without incurring penalty. (2) That the tw Archbishops should not be liable to penalty for refusing to con firm or to consecrate a person elected as bishop. (3) That th Prime Minister, before submitting any recommendation to Hi Majesty, should consult an advisory committee consisting o not less than seven persons, including the two Archbishops, t be chosen by the Prime Minister himself from the members o the Church Assembly, which committee should hold office dur ing the tenure of the Prime Minister appointing them, or for period of five years.

We are not ourselves, unfortunately, in the confidence o Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, but we can imagine what his repl will be to this offer to invest the Crown patronage in a clique o half a dozen members of the Church Assembly. He will pro bably say that Cathedral Chapters, if they have conscientiou scruples, can easily resign or go to prison, rather than appoin one whom they regard as an unfit person for the episcopal office

he spectacle of a highly-placed Church dignitary voluntarily ndergoing legal penalties, or giving up his job for conscience's ake, would impress the public. Or on the other hand he might ay to these reformers that they can have what they want at a rice—*i.e.* disestablishment and disendowment.

These proposals, which some will call statesmanlike, seem o us to evince a quite commonplace desire to make the best of oth worlds. We have little doubt that the Prime Minister, if e is half the man we take him to be, will ignore them.

A MYSTERY KEPT SECRET

By the Rev. G. F. Allen, M.A., Chaplain of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

THE Epistle to the Ephesians is held on good grounds to be a circular letter addressed by St. Paul to a number of hurches of proconsular Asia. It might with advantage still irculate in the Church.

In this Epistle St. Paul makes frequent reference to a ystery. He is probably borrowing a word, tinged with a sense f ecstatic fervour for his readers, from its association with the ults of their earlier pagan days. He speaks at the outset of God having abounded in wisdom, in having made known to us he mystery of His will (i, 9. The references are throughout to *Ephesians*, when no other Epistle is mentioned.) He says that t was by a special revelation that the mystery was made known o him (iii, 3). From the double parallel of man and wife, and Christ and the Church, while he warns his readers not to miss he practical lesson of marriage fidelity, his own mind recurs to he mystery (v, 32). His last request is that they will pray that tterance may be given to him boldly to proclaim the mystery, or which he is an ambassador in bonds (vi, 19). If we do not eel, in reading the Epistle, the excitement at the unfolding of mystery, we may be sure that we have misunderstood, and do ot see the matter as St. Paul does. In an earlier Epistle he as forestalled the reference to 'the mystery which was kept ecret since the world began' (*Rom.* xvi, 25). Were St. Paul to eturn to earth, he might be tempted to say that the Church, vhich he helped to found, has been at great pains to keep his nystery a secret ever since.

The mystery which St. Paul revealed was, of course, the inclusion of the Gentiles. But what does the inclusion of the Gentiles mean? In what were they included?

Saul, the Pharisee, belonged to a religion of which we may notice four characteristics:

1. It was *exclusive*. The Jews were a chosen people conscious of their separation from the rest of the world. Their particularism came from the not unworthy motive of preserving inviolate their higher conception of God. Under stress of foreign domination in the centuries before Christ, they had been at especial pains to keep their religion and their race free from heathen contamination.

2. It was *visible*. Judaism rested on external rites and signs, such as circumcision. In order to preserve their religion from dissipation, it was necessary to have some external signs which marked off the Jew from his Gentile neighbour.

3. It was *self-righteous*. The Pharisee had some cause to be proud of the superiority of his religion, and he was proud. The spirit of Pharisaism is aptly caricatured, if not indeed fairly represented, in the prayer, 'Lord, I thank Thee that I am not as other men are.' At rare times there flashed on the mind of Judaism the possibility of the not very dissimilar prayer, 'Lord, I pray Thee that other men may be like me.'

4. It was *authoritative*. Religion consisted in the acceptance and performance of a traditional code of teaching and law, the Torah. In general the law was willingly accepted as containing the word of Jahweh. In detail the Law might, and probably generally did, prescribe what individual reason and conscience would approve. If in any case it did not, so much the worse for individual conscience.

To Saul, a Pharisee of the Pharisees, there comes a vision of a better way. The vision of self-giving love, seen in a crucified Messiah, first provokes his violent opposition, to stifle the demands which it makes on his own allegiance; then suddenly wins full sway as it is re-enacted before him in the martyrdom of Stephen. The dying cry, 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge,' repeats the dying cry, 'Father, forgive them; they know not what they do.' Here is a love which accepts without complaint the suffering caused by sin; which, where others would see sin, sees

rather the ignorant striving for good; which hopes that by love into death the eyes of the ignorant will be opened. The eyes of St. Paul are opened. He can no longer kick against the pricks with which such love has demanded the response of his free conscience. Stephen, with the Christ-like love that redeems, sees, not Paul the sinner, persecuting the Church, but Paul the Pharisee, nobly loyal to religion as he knows it; Paul, in the face of such love, sees the vanity of the religion which seeks to achieve righteousness by meticulous observance of the law, and turns, a sinner, to accept the love which is the free gift of God. He goes out to proclaim the good news that [1] God in Christ loves and trusts all mankind, despite their sins, and that men may so love their fellow-men.

What does it mean when St. Paul goes on to say that in this new religion the Gentiles are included? There are three possibilities:

(*a*) He might mean that the Gentiles are to be persuaded to enter the Jewish society, which just differs from the old Judaism in accepting Jesus as the Christ. He may have caught that missionary enthusiasm which flickered for a moment in Judaism in the Second Isaiah, and in the author of the allegory, Jonah. The whole of St. Paul's mission is, however, obviously the denial of this. This was the Christianity of the Jerusalem community; but St. Paul had not so learnt Christ. The Epistle to the Galatians reverberates with a passion beyond words at such a betrayal of the Gospel as the insistence that the Gentiles be made to observe the Jewish Law. 'If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain' (*Gal.* ii, 21).

(*b*) He may mean that the Gentiles and the Jews are together to enter a new society, which is nominally different from Judaism, but which in practice bears all the characteristic marks of Judaism. So stated, this does not appear probable. This change of name without a change of substance would scarcely explain his excitement at the discovery of a mystery hid since the world began; it would scarcely explain the violence of his antagonism to the Judaizers; it would scarcely explain his own sudden conversion from Judaism. Nevertheless it is this interpretation which in later ages the Church has generally put on

[1] *Cf.* iv, 32. The original is God in Christ, not God for Christ's sake.

his words. To-day we are so steeped in the view that it is a Christian Church, with all the essential characteristics of Judaism, in which the Gentiles are included, that it is only in the rarest moments that the scales fall from our eyes and we so much as realize the possibility of a third interpretation.

The second interpretation of St. Paul's mystery is still deeply rooted in the Church to-day. The Church as we know it has all the essential characteristics of Judaism, and it is supposed that into such a Church St. Paul, and we his followers, invite those who are outside. For the word 'exclusive' we substitute the synonym 'Catholic.' Each branch of the Church draws the limit of catholicity so as to exclude all who fail to conform to her conventions. The Roman Church is Catholic just so far as the outer limits of Roman Catholicism; the Anglo-Catholics, on that reckoning excluded, themselves exclude all who are beyond their rules of Church membership; those who are so liberal as to recognize all Christian denominations, still exclude to-day the majority of their fellow-men. Though Christian charity at times proves stronger than the logic of the situation, and has recourse to casuistry, yet the logic of Catholicism gives an exclusive society of the faithful in a wicked world. Visibility is preserved as a necessary mark of exclusiveness, baptism merely being substituted for circumcision. Evangelism bears the self-righteous meaning that we who have the Spirit of God must convert to our way of thought those who have it not. If the individual goes beyond the recognized limits, in belief or conduct, in rejecting the authority of the Church, the Church respects, perhaps, his sincerity and politely compels him to leave her society.

According to this interpretation of St. Paul, within the new society all other barriers of class or race are, or ought to be, dissolved, but there is still left the great dividing barrier between men, those who conform to the thought and practice of the new institution and those who do not. This would remain even if we solved the many later barriers between various denominations. The mystery is a somewhat empty secret, for it leaves us to-day with a situation precisely similar to that in which St. Paul wrote, a small, highly organized religious community, regarding itself and to some extent regarded by others as jealously preserving

precious heritage in the midst of a pagan world. Is this what St. Paul intended when he wrote, as a Jew, to some of the pagans (ii, 16) 'that Christ might reconcile both unto God in one body by the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby'? It is possible that we should solve this final barrier by bringing all men into a visible Church; and it is possible that in attempting to do so we are following the example, not of St. Paul, but of the Jerusalem party, striving to bring the Gentiles into Judaism. Possibly the mystery was revealed only again to be concealed; possibly in the third interpretation there may yet be a solution of our present discontents.

The theology of St. Paul comes to life when it is realized that for him, as for his Master, belief in the Love of God, and in God as Love, is the first and dominant theme. In the cry, 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge,' he had learnt the love with which God loved him as a sinner, and with which God loves all other men, and with which men may learn to love one another. His most inspired and inspiring writing is the poem in praise of love; it is noteworthy that he means, as does our Lord, the intimacy and respect and trust of real affection, for he contrasts with true love the charity which gives even a whole fortune to feed the poor (*I Cor.* xiii, 3). Twice St. Paul echoes the words of Christ, that 'He that loveth hath fulfilled the law' (*Rom.* xii, 8, and *Gal.* v, 14). He exhorts the readers of *Ephesians* to preserve the relationship of true love in just those places where there is too often misunderstanding, between husband and wife, parent and child, master and slave. He prays (iii, 8) that, being rooted and grounded in love, they may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height, and to know the love of God which passeth knowledge.

(*c*) From this discovery of the Love of God in Christ, there follows inevitably the third interpretation of the mystery, which is as strange to the thought of the religious to-day as it was to the conscientious Pharisee Saul. God has no favourites. Under the shadow of the Cross all men are equal, sinners alike, yet alike loved and heirs of love. The exact observance of the rules of a religious institution gives us no special claim to the love of God, and gives us no right to exclude from our love

those who do not so conform. The disciple of Christ sees men no longer as Jew and Gentile, Churchgoer and pagan, righteous and sinner. Every neighbour is a member of the divine family. The one sin is the distrust and contempt of one of God's children; and it is a sin which lies especially close at the door of the religious who have come near, but have just failed to achieve, the vision of the all-embracing love of God. The one aim is by faith in one God to learn to have faith in man, and by this faith to build men up into a fellowship of trust. Institutional religion is valuable just in so far as it ministers to this end, and is pernicious when it becomes Pharisaical and offers love only to those within its own borders. Here is a mystery which justifies all St. Paul's excitement, for it involves a complete break with all his older theories of the divine community. If we too can abandon in our thought of the Church everything which falls short of the Love of God in Christ, then we too may find, like St. Paul, that Christ is our peace, reconciling men to one another and to God.

1. The Church of Christ is not like Judaism, exclusive, nor merely Catholic, but *universal*, embracing all mankind. If I believe in God as universal, and all-powerful, I shall believe that dominant in the conscience of every man is the voice of God, prompting to higher things; if I trust my neighbour, whoever he be, I shall by my trust make him trustworthy; if I fail to love and trust him, it is a defect of love in me. This present universality is the meaning of St. Paul's emphatic statement (iii, 6), '*εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα*' (Moffatt) 'in Christ Jesus, the Gentiles are co-heirs, and companions and co-partners.' The Authorized Translation, 'that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs,' suggests wrongly a patronizing inclusion in a promised land which others have and they as yet have not, and misses the true Pauline thought of the heritage of sonship by man as man. To the disciple of Christ each neighbour is a brother, regardless of whether or not he be righteous, and regardless of whether or not he be a member of a religious institution.

The universality of the Church is a paradox too great to stand without defence. Obviously some men recognize the all-compelling claim of love, others in ignorance seek some lesser

good; obviously of those who know the love of God in Christ, some are more and some less successful in attaining the measure of that love towards their neighbours. Here lies the reason, though not the justification, for the view of the Church as a small society of the faithful, maintaining a certain standard of love in the midst of a hostile world. The onlooker may say that the Church is the small society of those who most attain the outlook of their Master. If the disciple within the Church accepts this view, he will have fallen into the besetting sin of all religions, that spirit of self-righteous, exclusive Pharisaism which alone provoked his Master's condemnation. The disciple within the Church will know that, judged by the range of the love of God, all men are sinners and have failed.[2] The nearer the true disciple comes to the Spirit of Christ, the more does he feel that the failure of love in the world is in others ignorance, in himself alone sin, and that it is for him to attempt by universal love to redeem men from their ignorance. Thus conceived, the Church sets up no new barriers between man and man. If perfection is the sign of membership of the Church, then there are no members. If love is the sign of membership, then all men are in a measure members, and those are furthest from the heart of it who count themselves to be righteous. If to be loved and trusted by God, and to be worthy of the love of men, is the sign, then the Church is all mankind.

2. The Christian Church is necessarily *invisible*. The Church is the fellowship of men, in so far as they show to one another the love which God in Christ has shown to them; and love is a spirit which cannot be entrapped in external signs. To preserve the spirit of God in the world through external signs were as vain a task as to keep the sunlight in a room by closing the shutters. Signs indeed we may use to remind ourselves of our membership of the divine family, and to encourage one another in that universality of friendship which we have none of us attained. We may well symbolize by a simple ceremony that every child born into the world is born into the family of God. We may well symbolize the full fellowship for which we pray by a sacramental meal. In an imperfect world, society may well delegate some men, who shall make it their special task to lead

[2] *Cf. Rom.* xi, especially vv. 25, 26, 32.

others in worship and to proclaim the eternal truth that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. If it be thought that these external signs achieve anything in themselves, apart from the spirit of love to which they minister, then there come ringing out the words of St. Paul, 'Neither circumcision availeth anything, neither uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love' (*Gal.* v, 6); 'By grace are ye saved, through faith, not of works, lest any man should boast' (ii, 8). Outward and visible signs are useful but not necessary means of grace. It will always be possible for some to have the spirit of love in full measure, without the signs; and for others, who can boast, like Saul the Pharisee, an exact observance of all the outward signs of religious practice, entirely to lack the spirit. Once this is realized, the Church of to-day may see the folly of her sacramental controversies. For the Church of England to refuse to recognize the Free Church ministry without the laying on of hands is blindness not far removed from that sin against the Spirit which, for the sake of ecclesiastical prejudice, ascribed the divine spirit of love to the work of Satan. When Christian congregations learn to recognize the God of Love as not less present in the love of the non-ecclesiastical, and to respect their opinion that there is in present services a lack of truth and gaiety which naturally alienates them, then those who are alienated may find again the all-attractive love of Christ reflected in the Church.

3. The Church, if Christian, is *humble*, never self-righteous. Perhaps it is necessary to point out that the quality of humility is a great deal more militant than pride. Jesus, perfectly loving, sought to win men from their narrower prejudices by Himself bearing the result of their prejudices; perfect love, in the face of their rejection, does not blame them, but cries, 'My God, why hast thou forsaken me?' The disciple is not greater than his Lord.

As both Jesus and St. Paul saw, the condemnation of others is always a condemnation of him who thus sits in self-righteous judgment on his fellows.[3] To say this is not to ignore the fact of sin, the fact that the Kingdom is very far from realization. The point is that it is love, not self-righteous criticism, which is powerful to redeem the world from sin. God sends His rain on the just and the unjust: man is bidden trust a neighbour who

[3] *Cf. Matt.* viii, 1; *Rom.* ii, 1 *f.*

has let him down 490 times; by then forgiveness would have become a habit. The Kingdom comes when each man dares, like Christ, to see around him everywhere the striving for a light which is dimly seen, within himself alone the condemnation that that light is not revealed in all its purity. This is the secret of that divine enjoyment in the saying of Robert Louis Stevenson, 'One person I have to make good, myself; my duty towards my neighbour is much more nearly expressed by saying I have to make him happy.' This is the secret of that otherwise obscure saying of St. Paul, which holds the key to the doctrine of the Atonement, 'He who knew no sin, He made to be sin on our behalf' (*II Cor.* v, 21). Love sees each man, be he righteous or self-righteous or sinful, as the man sees himself from within, striving through darkness for light; love, taking to itself the blame for darkness, opens men's eyes to the truth that love is light.

This difficult humility, with which love that is perfect refrains from any judgment of love that is less perfect, is the attitude of St. Paul in *Ephesians*. He has learnt the power of this love in his own conversion. If he says that the Gentiles were before dead in trespasses and sins, St. Paul, with all the heritage of Judaism behind him, hastens to add, 'in the which we also walked' (ii, 3). Of those who fail, St. Paul — like Stephen, like Peter, and like our Lord — speaks rather of ignorance than of sin. His readers were alienated from the life of God because of the ignorance which was in them (iv, 18). It is an amusing example of the strength of Pharisaic prejudice that Thayer Grimm's Lexicon says that in this one case the colourless word ἄγνοια means inexcusable ignorance. The attitude towards evil is not to reprove it (v, 11 and 13), a word which fails to do justice to the Greek and makes nonsense of the second of these verses, but rather to let the light expose it. Moffatt translates these verses, 'Have nothing to do with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather expose them; one is indeed ashamed to speak of what such men do in secret; still, whatever the light exposes becomes illuminated.'

This attitude of love and respect, which has confidence that each man is striving for such truth and goodness as he has seen, should be the relation of the Church to all mankind as her members. The true disciple of Christ does not seek to convert his

fellow-men to all his opinions; he trusts and respects and encourages their power, like his, to recognize truth and goodness; he seeks only that in himself the love which is the goal of their search shall be seen. So long as the ministers of the Church assume it to be their task to judge and condemn all who do not conform to their conventions of religious thought and practice, they, like the Pharisee, will need to compass sea and land before they find one proselyte to their own unlovely attitude. In all humility, the Church as she is to-day must be prepared to learn, from those whom she has alienated from her services and from her ministry, how she has managed to make religion appear uninteresting, and God seem an obscure Being, aloof from the world of love and life and laughter. When a minister of the Church has learnt to respect the opinion and admire the sincerity of someone whom he cannot but think misguided, then, but not till then, he is in a position, in fellowship with him, to draw near to the God of Truth and Love whom they each seek, and whose perfect service they have neither of them attained.

4. The Christian Church must be, not dogmatic or authoritative, but *free*. This is our faith, that God is universal, and omnipotent with the all-attractive power of love. If we present simply God in Christ, Love Incarnate, then all men will be drawn to Him, and will acknowledge together that love is the object of their aspiration. Even if the appeal of love appears to fail and to be conquered by men's prejudices, we shall still, like Jesus, retain our faith in God and man, confident that love will triumph of its own power, through failure and death if not through life.

If the Church goes on to insist on further doctrines, or rules of conduct or ceremony, and to attempt to enforce them with her authority, then, as is only too clear, instead of uniting nations and classes, she will drive yet more and deeper barriers between men. In a curiously modern phrase, St. Paul says that the root of the alienation between those within institutional religion and those without is just this, *τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι* (ii, 15); 'religious teaching presented as though it were an imperial decree.'

The Church will only unite all men in the essential, simple, yet infinitely difficult faith in God as Love when, following the

xample of Jesus and Paul, she says that love fulfils the law, nd declares explicitly that the historic Creeds are only one of nany possible developed expressions of this faith. Trusting ll men, we shall see that, where one treasures the Creed as the xpression of his faith in the love of God, another, desiring ove not less, abhors the Creed as a dead weight of lifeless ogma, and a third, working perhaps most for love, ignores the reed, each is right, each has his place in the Church and his nessage for the world. It is because Christ for St. Paul stands imply for Love Incarnate, that He appears as the peacemaker, niting the existing aspirations of both Jew and Gentile, and bolishing the barrier wall between them. When the Church ecognizes the full Christianity of those who reject her rules, as t. Paul recognized the full Christianity of those who rejected he Law, then she will unite all men in the worship of God in Christ.

Having thus simplified her faith, the Church can proclaim t with that conviction which is the only true form of authority. She will respect the full freedom of conscience and reason of ll men, whether or not they are her members. She will appeal o all men to bring their own present idealism into her fellow-hip. To attempt to force on men the unwilling tyranny of uthoritative teaching is to distrust the power of the Spirit of God in their hearts. The central good news of the Love of God does not need to be propped up with the authority of the Church or of tradition, for the Church will have confidence that ach man will welcome the Gospel when he hears it.

We need to discover again that secret which is always hidden by our narrow prejudices, that all men are sons of God and heirs of God; and that, as we ourselves have received the love of God, not of our merit but of His grace, so we in turn may offer love and respect to all our fellow-men. Thus, believing n the Church universal, we shall, as followers of the love of Christ, redeem men from the evil which blinds them to love, and ttain the Church universal. Trusting utterly to God in Christ, ll-loving and all-powerful, we shall break down the enmity which exists still, not least between 'Jew' and 'Gentile,' and shall find, as St. Paul did, that Jesus is our peace, reconciling nen to one another and to God.

THE DECLINE OF THE WEST

By the Rev. F. L. Cross, M.A., B.Sc., Librarian of Pusey House, Oxford.

'IN this book the attempt is made for the first time to predetermine the course of history.' This is the claim which Spengler makes in the opening sentence of his *Decline of the West*. If the attempt is successful, it is obvious that the book is one of the highest importance, not merely to the historian, but also to the statesman, to the business-man, to the social reformer, to the priest. For what appears to be the greatest obstacle to the proper organization of such of its powers and forces as Nature has placed at our disposal is our ignorance of the course of future history.

The English translation of the second volume of Spengler's treatise (which, together with the first volume, runs to nearly 1,000 large and closely-packed pages) has recently appeared.[1] The book has, however, a considerable history behind it. The author informs us that it was planned and almost completed before the outbreak of the War. It was published just before the War ended. For the first few years after its publication it had a colossal circulation in Germany. Over 100,000 copies were sold; and that a two-volume book of portly dimensions at a time when the intellectual world of Germany was passing through a period of great financial strain. *A priori* a possible explanation of its large circulation might have been that the book was bought by the industrialists, who were at that period spending money as fast as they could make it to guard against the effects of inflation. But could they be expected to care to purchase a book whose chief thesis depended on the most detailed knowledge of such subjects as Chinese music, Greek arithmetic, Persian history, the economic principles of the Crusaders, the mysticism of the fourteenth century, Renaissance ornamentation, eighteenth century physics? No. The book was evidently written for the intellectuals, and only the intellectuals would have troubled to acquire it and read it.

[1] *The Decline of the West*, Vol. II. Perspectives of World History. Translated by C. F. Atkinson. London, Allen and Unwin, 1929. Price 21/-.

The title of the treatise is far from suggesting its contents. here is singularly little space devoted to the particular theme the decline of Western civilization. The author defends his esis indirectly. He allots most of his space to the establish- ent of a major premiss. Once this premiss is granted, the pre- rious position of Western civilization follows immediately om it.

According to Spengler, human history is a long series of stinct Cultures,[2] all of which pass through exactly correspond- g stages, spiritually, mentally, politically, economically, artis- cally, and so on. Each is a unit itself, and after an initial riod of pre-development, it grows into a period of full blos- ming and expansion; and then enters upon a long period of cline. The similarity between the several Cultures is so close at at corresponding stages of different Cultures the corres- nding man will appear if necessary, to effect the corresponding ansformation. Thus, between Napoleon, who inaugurated the riod of 'Civilization' in Western Culture, and Alexander the reat, who did likewise in Classical World, there is more than mere chance similarity. It was *essential* that there should have en a Napoleon in Western civilization to achieve what he did; d anyone who had studied the Classical World could in the iddle of the eighteenth century have predicted with certainty at a Napoleon was about to appear.

The great cleft across every cultural unit is that which cor- sponds to the stage at which the Alexander or the Napoleon pears. Prior to that date, there has been a long creative period. 'ulture' has been confined to the few, and the masses have cessarily been forced to live in conditions of slavery. But m the few have come products of true value. With the ad- nt of the Alexander, the period of 'Civilization' enters upon e scene. His appearance is one of the inevitable signs of the d. Creation in art and literature ceases; and there follows a riod of technology, of Americanization. All the achievements the creative period are now distributed broadcast. Everyone

[2] There is an unfortunate ambiguity in Spengler's use of the word 'ulture.' In its narrower sense it is used in contrast to Civilisation, its wider sense as including both Culture in the narrower sense *and* ilization. In the text here, the wider sense is intended.

receives 'education.' But the power of creation has vanished. The poet is replaced by the historian of literature, the artist by the archaeologist. And the only achievements of this epoch are the work of the technologist and the engineer. Easy communication of ideas, rapid transport, the growth of wealth, world dominion—such are the characteristics of the period of civilization.

> 'The energy of the culture-man is directed inwards, that of the culture-man outwards' (I, 37).

Civilization, too, passes through its successive stages; but these stages are likewise pre-determined, and have only one nemesis, their own extinction.

> 'The transition from Culture to Civilisation was accomplished for the Classical World in the Fourth Century (B.C.), for the Western in the Nineteenth Century. . . Chaeronea and Leipsig were the last battles fought about an idea' (I, 32, 34).

The life of each cultural unit, then, may be compared with the life of a plant. It passes through the stages of growth, blossoming, and decay. But like different plants, each cultural unit has a peculiar character of its own which persists through all the changes. Each gives rise to what in the terminology of Professor Whitehead might be described as an essentially different and characteristic 'mental climate,' and in consequence the *nuance* which a particular event assumes in any one culture will never be quite the same as it possesses in any other. Spengler holds that the Classical World was Apollinian, that Western Culture is Faustian. The Greco-Roman world thought essentially in terms of space. Its mathematics naturally took the form of Euclidean Geometry, its art tended to take the form of sculpture. It lived in the eternal present. The Western world, on the other hand, finds its characteristic expression in the soul of Faust. It has the desire to be ever experiencing new facts, to see things from new angles. Its universe is not a closed system, such as was that of the Ancient World. It ceaselessly tries to penetrate into the infinite past. Only the Western world could have discovered the Differential Calculus. Only the Western world could have constructed the Non-Euclidean geometries. Only the Western world could interpret everything in terms of

volution and development. Only the Western world could ave adopted perspective drawing.

So far, reference has been made to only two of the Cultural nits with which the *Decline of the West* deals, the Apollinian id the Faustian. Something must be said, however, of one her Culture of which Spengler treats, namely, Arabian Cul- re. Its great importance lies in the fact that it was in this ulture that Christianity took its origin.

Arabian Culture differs both from Western and from Clas- al Culture in that it is a pseudo-morphosis. This term, bor- wed from the vocabulary of mineralogy, is intended to indi- te that it developed on an alien soil. For this reason, it was lable to grow to full self-consciousness; it passed the first part its life embedded in the Classical World, the latter part of it the Western World. Its earliest beginnings, however, are to sought outside the Classical World, in Persia. Christianity, e Judaism, is an incident within it. Arabian, or as Spengler so terms it Magian, Culture embraces several Eastern reli- ons from Zoroastrianism to Islam, and Christianity can be derstood only as one of a series of religions in which its arest relatives are the Mandaean religion and the other ystery Religions. The point in Magian development at which ese religions appeared was relatively early, for true religion always the product of the initial stages of a Culture. It is such epochs that the genuine saint arises, he for whom reli- on needs no other justification except itself. Jesus of Nazareth this respect was no exception.

> 'To ascribe social purposes to Jesus is a blasphemy. His occasional utterances of a social kind, so far as they are authentic and not merely attributed sayings, tend merely to edification. They contain nothing whatever of new doctrine, and they include proverbs of the sort then in general currency' (II, 217). 'Religion is first and last meta- physic, otherworldliness (*Jenseitigkeit*), awareness in a world of which the evidence of the senses merely lights the foreground. . . It is the Late, city periods that, no longer capable of seeing into depths, have turned the remnants of religiousness upon the external world, and replaced religion by humanities, and metaphysic by moralisation and social ethics' (*ibid.*).

From Jesus onwards, the history of Christianity is mainly struggle between Arabian and non-Arabian *Weltgefühl.*

The inevitable transformation of Christianity began with S Paul. At the time of St. Augustine, the Pelagian controver was the controversy between the Magian and Faustian sou The Faustian is always conscious of himself as an Ego.

> 'But it is precisely the impossibility of an Ego as a free pow in the face of the Divine that constitutes "Islam." . . . Actuall Augustine was the last great thinker of Early Arabian Scholasticis anything but a Western intellect' (II, 240f.).

We turn now from exposition to criticism. And, first to th capacities and technique of the author.

The facts to which reference has been made will have i dicated that Spengler claims to possess intimate knowledge o the most diverse fields of learning. The extent of his professe knowledge in such widely separated fields is so great that w should have been prepared for occasional, perhaps frequen blunders from which those who had confined their studies t more limited ground are expected to be free. But the impressio gained from reading, for example, Spengler's pages on th growth of Christianity suggests that he has derived most of h information, not from study of the original documenta material, most frequently not even from the accredited author ties, but rather from a number of writers who are by no mean representative, and without any attempt at control. Thus, in h exposition of Magian Culture, he is evidently much indebted t Reitzenstein and Dieterich, neither of whom any scholar wi use without a critical eye to every one of their assertions; bu Spengler never seems to consider the possibility of what he ac cepts from them as being in error.[3] Those who need furthe assurance on this point might do well to investigate how man errors there are contained in the single assertion, wisely omitte from the later editions (and from the English translation):

> 'Descartes, a profound thinker of the Port-Royal group, followe an inner impulse occasioned by his philosophical-mathematical instru tions, and converted both the Countess Palatine Elizabeth and th Queen Christina back to Catholicism.'

Spengler is pre-eminently the competent journalist. He ha (as far as I can ascertain) never held any academic position, an

[3] Professor Kirsopp Lake epigrammatically remarked once of Reitzen stein that the inaccuracy of his references is almost rendered innocuous b the obscurity of his style.

s the journalist's contempt for the professed scholar. The holar, like everyone and everything else in the Modern World ncluding presumably himself[4]), he regards as inevitable; but e calm with which he regards most of these inevitabilities of story is ruffled when he deals with the modern scholar, and rticularly with the modern pseudo-philosopher.

'Truly (he writes in derision) it is a poor life's work to restate once more, in slightly different terms, views of a hundred predecessors on the Will or on psycho-physical parallelism. This may be a profession, but a philosophy it emphatically is not' (I, 43).

ne productions of the successful journalist make a much more mediate appeal than the intricacies of the theory of sense-rception. It is largely because Spengler uses the journalist's cks—the assumption of an unlimited knowledge on the part his public, the constant impression that he is trying to con-nce and not to inform or teach his readers—that he is so ex-mely interesting.

The word 'Journalism,' however, does not settle the matter. would be wrong to suppose that these rather obvious and cer-nly serious defects detract altogether from the value of his rk. Spengler has gifts in another direction which any scholar ght be proud to possess. He has a real power of historical uition. His generalisations may be over-dogmatic, and his cts frequently in need of correction. But at every turn there e flashes of genius; and behind the connexions which he dis-vers between different events there is certainly a large measure truth. He sees clearly that the categories which determine the torical process are of a peculiar character, and that the twelve thematical or semi-mathematical categories of the *Critique of re Reason* fail completely in the face of the events of history. Unfortunately, Spengler is carried off his feet by his his-ical sense. His history becomes Historicism. Everything is ordinated to history, and hence the relative character which aches to all historical events is transferred to everything else. ere is no absolute truth, not even in mathematics.

'There is not *one* sculpture, *one* painting, *one* mathematics, *one* physics, but many, each in its deepest essence different from the others, each limited in duration and self-contained, just as each species of plant has its peculiar blossom or fruit, its special type of growth and decline' (I, 21).

[4] Cp. Vol. I, Introduction, § xv.

If Spengler had been prepared to go the whole way with this scepticism, he would have entrenched himself in an impregnable position. But to go the whole way is what Spengler refuses to do. He attempts to combine a relativistic view of the parts of history with an absolutist view of history taken as a whole. Sculpture, painting, mathematics, and physics are relativized but the Spenglerian theory of the historical process as a whole is absolute. Spengler sets out to defend a thesis as to the succession of historical events; and unless he allows absolute validity to the principles of thought, to what Leibniz termed the *mathesis universalis*, he abandons at the outset the only weapon by which his or any other thesis can be defended. Spengler has inverted the true relation of history and thought.

No one can fail to be impressed by the acumen with which Spengler's main thesis, the necessary corollary of which is that Western civilization is rapidly declining, is developed. There are only two alternatives. The alleged parallel courses of different cultures are either very ingeniously devised or else they are true. The unwary may be inclined to accept the latter alternative. But we venture to think that the former is more likely to prove correct. With an extraordinary degree of plausibility, the history of the world is cast into a number of moulds of the same character. And the conviction with which Spengler defends his thesis is so great that the actual facts become distorted under its magic. To return to the example from which we set out, there appears to be a considerable similarity between the achievements of Alexander and those of Napoleon. But Caesar has also been regarded as the prototype of Napoleon, as Spengler admits; and we may well doubt whether the one analogy is more 'morphologically inacceptable' (I, 4) than the other. It is only the Procrustean bed on which the course of history is stretched in the *Decline of the West* that makes the connexion between Napoleon and Alexander appear closer than that between Napoleon and Caesar.

It is natural to compare the pessimism of Spengler with that of the Dean of St. Paul's. Both are agreed that Western civilization will not go on a great deal longer. But the pessimism of Inge is largely rooted in the belief that the conditions of the

wentieth century are something for which we and our fore-fathers have been responsible. By greater foresight in the past we might have been saved from our present plight; and even now it is not too late to introduce measures which will delay, if not ultimately prevent, our decline. Dr. Inge agrees with Spengler that the present triumph of democracy and the over-population of the West are closely bound up with the downfall which is to follow; but for Inge, neither the one nor the other was inevitable. There is a strong moral fibre running through the pessimism of Inge for which Spengler's outlook on history could never have found a place.

Is there any hope for the future? Spengler seems to think that a new Culture may arise out of the ruins of Russia. But it must not be sought either in the nationalism of the pre-War Russian ruling classes, nor in the Bolshevism to which it has now given place. It lies dormant in those sections of the population which are out of touch with both these powers. Its herald is Dostojewski. Russia has in the past been largely governed by those who have been foreigners, especially since its Westernization by Peter the Great. Tolstoi was thoroughly Western in his social ideals. He was simply the Western demagogue in a foreign dress.

> 'Tolstoi's Christianity was a misunderstanding. He spoke of Christ, and meant Karl Marx' (II, 196).

Dostojewski, with his hatred of the Western ideal, is the true Russian. His sentiments were those expressed in a letter written to him in 1863:

> 'The first condition for emancipation for the Russian soul is that it should hate Petersburg with all its might and all its soul' (II, 193).

When the wave of Bolshevism has passed away, the dawn may appear in Russia.

PARLIAMENT AND THE CHURCH

By A. Wyatt Tilby.

BEFORE the late General Election each of the three political parties produced an official programme which was accepted, with individual additions and reservations, by every official candidate. In two of the three cases these programmes were far more than mere planks or platforms; in size and variety of content they resembled a political Whiteleys, whose object was to keep in stock any and every reform that might conceivably appeal to voters of any age or either sex. But not one of the three parties advocated Disestablishment; indeed, not one of them even mentioned the Church of England.

From this omission an intelligent visitor from Thibet might possibly conclude that while the political condition of our country was serious and its economic situation desperate, its spiritual state was nearly perfect, and that the lamentable decline in the coal and cotton trades was more than offset by a beneficent increase in religion and piety. The actual diagnosis is somewhat different.

Party politicians naturally prefer issues which consolidate rather than issues which cut across party lines. The Established Church has members in all parties. Many of these would certainly defend the Church against attack by any party. A few would probably put the Church above even their own party. Most politicians, including those who are not actually members of the Church, would probably regret an attack on it, on the simple but sufficient ground that as an institution it does more good than harm; to which they might add as an afterthought the fear that an attack upon it might do the party that initiated it more harm than good.

It was said long ago that the Church of England was not large enough for Newman, but was exactly the right size for Keble. It is to-day exactly the right size for the House of Commons; it is under the State but above party. The Church made its bargain with the State in the Enabling Act, and so long as

ne Church is satisfied with the terms and observes them in the pirit and the letter, there is, politically speaking, no reason to hange.

This attitude appears, at least to politicians, to be sensible nd straightforward. Doctrinally the Church may be a com-romise between Rome and Geneva; but in politics a com-romise which has lasted close on four hundred years is very early a first principle. Politicians are essentially pragmatists, nd the fact that the Established Church is older than the ritish Empire and twice as old as the United States is com-only taken as sufficient proof that its constitution is not un-ound. If the Church is satisfied, the Church is safe; for the tate is more interested in economic than theological doctrine.

It is true that even politically there are elements of potential anger. The ordinary Conservative, of course, still stands for ne Establishment as a matter of constitutional principle. He perhaps rather hazy about the arguments, as any man may easonably be when a subject has dropped out of sight for everal years, but he is traditionally in favour of Establishment, nd the tradition still holds good. He would rather not fight on at issue, but he would fight on it if the challenge came from ne of the other parties. The Liberal party, on the other hand, traditionally in favour of Disestablishment and Disendow-ent—in spite of Mr. Lloyd George's famous protest against ands dripping with the fat of sacrilege.' Disestablishment as certainly dropped out of the Liberal programme. But it ould easily be restored. Perhaps more easily than the Liberal arty could be restored.

The Socialist position is somewhat different. The Labour arty has never officially defined its attitude towards the Church. contains as many religious men as other parties, but the pro-ortions are different. The old guard of Trade Unionism mostly me of Nonconformist stock, and the leanings of the Hender-n wing would naturally be towards Disestablishment if the uestion became active. The few Roman Catholics, like Mr. lynes and Mr. Wheatley, may for this purpose be disregarded; oman influence on British politics appears to be negligible, nd the official view is certainly not Socialist. But there is also considerable, and growing, body of Socialist Anglo-Catholics;

and among these are a number of clergy sympathetic to, or actually members of the Labour party. Their attitude would certainly have to be taken into account; and if it happened to coincide with that of the Nonconformist element, which is already in principle favourable to Disestablishment, the result would probably be decisive. Disestablishment would fall in with the views of the party, and Disendowment would certainly fall in with the views of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The subject is not likely to be raised in this Parliament, whose life will probably be short but vivid. But given a certain set of circumstances, it might easily become acute in the next. Two separate streams of thought, however, would have to flow together before Disestablishment became an active political issue, and both these streams would be of ecclesiastical rather than political origin.

In the first place, the movement for Disestablishment would have to come from within the Church, and not, as in the past, from without. If, owing to changed social or religious circumstances, the Church of England found it impossible any longer to carry on its work effectively under the present system, and a majority—or even a very substantial but influential minority—of the clergy and active laity announced, after careful deliberation, that Disestablishment was essential to spiritual success, Parliament would find it difficult to refuse the demand.

That position has certainly not yet arisen. It is true that the Bishop of Durham has put forward an eloquent plea for Disestablishment; a previous Bishop of Hereford did the same some years ago. But one swallow does not make a summer, and members of Parliament have not found any general demand for Disestablishment in their constituencies. It may be said that they have avoided the subject. True; but politicians fighting contested elections find it difficult to avoid subjects in which electors take lively interest.

In the second place, the movement to get round the Parliamentary rejection of the Prayer Book may possibly reinforce the Bishop of Durham's plea, and precipitate Disestablishment. The political world is watching with a certain detached interest the evolution of ecclesiastical ethics, and it is frankly a little puzzled at the position.

Parliament is certainly not unfriendly to the Church as a Church, as its attitude towards Scottish Church Reunion recently showed. It would accept without demur a Bill for the reunion of any of the Nonconformist bodies with the Church of England, probably scrutinizing the property clauses rather carefully and passing over doctrinal issues with the bare minimum of comment; and it intended to be friendly to the Church of England when it accepted that body's own proposals for a revision of the relationship between Church and State in the Enabling Act ten years ago. But Parliament is less friendly to the Church now than it was eighteen months back; and for this there are adequate reasons.

Under the terms of the Act, Parliament had a perfect right to accept or reject the Prayer Book; and having rejected it, had the right to assume either that the old one would continue to be used or that another new one, omitting the parts to which the House of Commons had taken exception, would be put forward. The second edition offended many and pleased nobody; and since then neither the one course nor the other has been adopted. The Church has neither acquiesced in nor repudiated the verdict of Parliament; and a series of manœuvres, which may be merely technical but which appear to be tortuous, has flowed.

The position as it stands is puzzling, but there is an unpleasant suspicion (probably baseless) abroad that it is intended to be puzzling, and that the clergy have forgotten how to play cricket. The plain man thinks that in their first innings the Bishops' eleven was out l.b.w., and in their second they hit their own wicket; it is now their turn to take the field, and not dispute the umpire's verdict.

In this country, at least, laws are made to be obeyed, and contracts are entered into in order that they may be fulfilled. There is no desire to construe the Enabling Act with the exact legal precision of an income-tax case in the High Court, but the bond must either be accepted or repudiated; the Church must either observe the terms it agreed to in 1919 or else show that the position has so completely changed in one short decade that the constitution must be altered. So far as politicians are aware, there has been no attempt to do either. There have been many activities but no conclusion.

The result is unfortunate. The Church of England is a larger and probably a wealthier body than the Church of Scotland. But as a result of ten years' legislation, the Church of Scotland has strengthened its position, and a careful reading of recent Acts of Parliament leads to the definite conclusion that the Presbyterian Church has now rather more autonomy than the Church of England.

It would be difficult to suggest that this is due to any Parliamentary preference or prejudice; it seems rather due to the fact that the Church of Scotland knew exactly what it wanted, presented its demand with a united voice, and got it sanctioned; whereas the Church of England was and is obviously divided. When Bishops write articles criticizing each other's doctrine in the popular press, the most ignorant of laymen realizes that episcopal gaiters bear no resemblance to the regimental step of the Grenadier Guards; and when a Bishop corresponds publicly with his Archbishop on the relative merits of Rome and Tennessee, the average church-goer (or for the matter of that, the average non-church-goer) is quite ready to decide whether his own spiritual home is in the diocese of Birmingham or Truro.

On the whole, the Church of England is politically weaker than ten years ago. In saying this, I do not forget that the Enabling Act has facilitated the removal of anomalies and abuses in the functioning of the Church. Ecclesiastical Bills which were obstructed or crowded out before the war now pass through Parliament almost unnoticed as Measures to be simply accepted or rejected. All this is to the good; but the trouble over the Prayer Book, and the post-rejection manœuvres, have more than neutralized the gains. After all, very few people know anything about the smaller Measures that have passed. But everybody knows something about the large Measure that was rejected.

Everybody knows, too, that Parliament, like any other sovereign body, is jealous of its prerogative, and is unlikely to look with too favourable an eye on an institution which at least appears to be trying to get back on the swings what it has lost on the roundabouts. In this respect, however, it must be said that the demand for spiritual liberty is understood quite differently by politicians and parsons. The political view, which

has the merit of simplicity, is that every man is spiritually free until he has taken the oath, and that that oath necessarily binds him within its limits. If and when he finds those limits intolerable, he can resign and either join or found another body; but he cannot be both an officer in the army and repudiate the King's regulations.

The short way out of these troubles is undoubtedly Disestablishment. But looking at the matter objectively, I doubt whether the short way is the better way. Disestablishment of course means Disendowment, which would alter the basis of the Church and probably cripple it everywhere outside the big towns, and almost certainly result in a split. It is no light thing to bring to an end an institution which has functioned since the time of Queen Elizabeth; the gains are doubtful, and the losses certain.

The more excellent way would be to submit to Parliament a Revised Prayer Book which Parliament would accept; it would be sufficient to omit the section relating to Reservation, and such a book would pass almost without debate or division. If necessary this could be regarded as an interim and transitory measure, sufficient for the next ten years or so while the Church considered its future course; and then, after an interval for reflection and discussion, the ecclesiastical authorities could press for such alterations in doctrine as seemed to them essential. Time does after all change the angle of vision, in sacred as in secular things; and it is possible that the lapse of a decade will make other points seem more important than the heated controversies of the present-time day. My knowledge of Victorian disputes is a little scanty, but I seem to recollect that baptismal regeneration was then the burning topic. The very ashes of that famous affair are cold to-day.

This is, of course, a political view, and politicians are sometimes charged with Erastianism. But we have to make the best of the world in which we live; and Parliaments do not go to Canossa.

THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH

VI. THEOLOGY.

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick.

IT is generally agreed by those best able to judge, that there is considerable need for a renewal of religious vitality. Ours appears to be a time of spiritual penury. Such periods occur from time to time, and have been attributed to various causes. The material conditions of life may be unfavourable to religion; or the prevailing mental atmosphere may blight it; or there may be degeneration of racial stock; or a religion may have had its day and be on the decline or actually moribund. Such conditions or factors, and others besides, have in the past affected the life of religions, even of the Christian religion, and it may be that some of them at present affect the condition of the Church of England, and are reducing its vitality to a low ebb.

The trouble is that vitality, when it has once been lowered, is not easy to stimulate. Also, periods of intense vitality have a way of being followed by something very like collapse. You can never be sure how to generate a religious revival, and to keep the new vitality going is still more difficult. Thus the problem before those who want to set the English Church upon its legs again is by no means simple.

Some declare (and there is much to be said in favour of it) that what we need is a new theology, since the old fabric is in ruins. But to suppose that a new theology would prove a panacea of our troubles is to take a superficial view of them. A new theology is certainly necessary; no one any longer believes the old doctrines *in the sense in which they were originally held*. This is a commonplace which it would be wearisome to labour; and in any case no one any longer disputes it. A new theology is indispensable, and will in due course be forthcoming if, but only if, our religion has enough vitality to produce one. For it is important to remember that it is religious life which produces theology, and not theology religious life. Theology, old or new, cannot create spiritual life; that would be a reversal of the actual process. A religious revival creates

own theology. A ready-made theology did not create ristianity; Christianity gradually fashioned a theology for elf. The process took some centuries, and only ceased be- use civilization collapsed, not because its task was done. It as the thirteenth century religious revival which created holastic theology, not St. Thomas Aquinas the religious vival.

It is true that the unreality of much of our ecclesiastical eology, the remoteness of some of our academic theology, and e incredible nature of all our popular theology, do constitute tween them a very heavy handicap to religious vitality, and lp to increase our spiritual inanition. But the handicap, grave it is, is restrictive only. That is to say, even if all these rdens and fetters were removed, and if the theology were rapped as most of it deserves to be, the result would only be at a negative, repressive force had been lifted. Nothing would ppen unless, beneath the smothering ruins, something vital rked. The mere removal of a fetter will not enable a lame an to walk; unless, of course, the lameness has been caused the fetter, in which case the afflicted man may gradually cover life and activity. In short, growth and expansion of iritual life, though they might follow the demolition of the d theology, would not themselves be the actual fruit of that molition. Demolition of effete theology only forms the pre- dent condition without which the revival of spiritual life is possible; it cannot create, or force into existence, that re- val. The Spirit bloweth where it listeth. Our theology may t only itself be dead; it may itself, like some great coffin, ver a corpse. We have to face this possibility. On the other nd, our theology may contain and imprison that which is ive. It may be like an egg with the young chick tapping on e shell. It may need only to be destroyed to release the living ing.

From one point of view, then, the attacks to which the ditional theology is being submitted on all sides are an indi- tion that the shell does not cover a corpse, but something nich is alive; and indeed very much alive. The cracking and minent breakdown of the old theological system is, from this int of view, a hopeful sign.

It has to be admitted that this view does not commonly prevail in ecclesiastical circles, where theological stability and immobility are regarded as signs of spiritual vitality. But what we may term the ecclesiastical view is based upon a theory of the function and origin of dogma which will not bear historical examination. That theory is that we are in possession of a supernaturally revealed dogmatic system. But no scientific student of the history of doctrine holds this view. It is no longer taught by the theological school of any reputable University. To attack this uncritical, unhistorical, and discredited view forms no part of our present purpose, since to slay the slain becomes wearisome. Yet it had to be mentioned in order to account for the otherwise unaccountable devotion of many people to the idea of an unchanged and unchangeable theology.

The fact seems to be that religion, like science and art, is a manifestation of human life and activity. Human vitality finds in religion, as in art and science, a sphere for creative activity. We need not now enter into the profound philosophical question whether the human spirit, when creative in art, science, or religion, is the instrument of creative powers lying somehow beyond humanity. This question lies outside the scope of our inquiry. All that it concerns us to insist upon is that it has to be put and answered similarly in each of the three spheres—art, science, and religion. If the creative power in the case of one is divine, it is so too in the case of the others. If religion is supernatural, so also are science and art. These three human activities stand or fall together. This has a bearing upon our view of theological doctrine, otherwise we would not have troubled our readers with a view which is self-evident. If in art and science there are no supernaturally revealed and unchangeable dogmatic systems, it follows that in religion there are no such things either. And if they do come into existence, they are anomalous and artificial fabrications which restrict or prevent creative activity. Such indeed would be the cause of our present religious dullness in comparison with our activity in science and in art. Religion never gets a chance so long as theology is stabilized.

For the fact is that the human spirit can only be creative when it is free. It cannot be creative in science if the truth about everything is already known and established. It cannot be

reative in art without freedom to experiment in new forms and ew methods; in a word, to take its own line. It is of course rue that the individual experimentalist in science or in art who hooses to be so free as to disregard the achievements of others p to date, is not likely to register any remarkable advances. gnorance, inexperience, and conceit are not necessarily the arents of genius. Technique in science and in art (as in reli- ion) is an accumulated heritage to which even the most heaven- ent genius lies under heavy obligations. But to use the past is ot the same thing as to be a slave to it. Thus, though tradition indispensable as a basis, it should not form an impassable arrier. A tradition is only useful if it is taken to be what it is, *e.* accumulated experience, and not a limit but a starting point.

We have denied that our primary need is for a new theology, ven though the old theology is no longer credible. Theology not the present need at all unless it will consent to regard self as purely provisional and temporary. A new theology hich adopted airs of finality would be a far more serious ob- acle to religion than the present theology, since it would expect be taken seriously, whereas every man interprets the old eology as he will. Philosophically, too, the present age is ngularly inappropriate for creed-making, for there exists no niversally accepted system of ideas in terms of which to con- ruct the new theology. And if such a system did exist for the oment, it would have been superseded in twenty years; for owadays there is no finality in philosophy any more than there in science.

Meanwhile the old theology is chiefly harmful as a deterrent arning people off the religious preserve. Organised religion, otected by creed barriers, preserves itself from those creative dividuals who have new ideas and new experiences to con- bute to the sum total of spiritual culture.

Already the policy has proved so successful as to prevent any members of the educated classes seeking to be ordained to e ministry of the Church. The bishops are now sending out gent appeals for money to train uneducated youths in semin- es, since the sons of middle-class parents, educated in condary schools, public schools, and universities, find too any intellectual difficulties in the orthodox theology.

The situation now is that those individuals who might help to generate a revival of religion are warned off the religious preserve. They take up science, business, philanthropy, art, anything, in short, but religion.

A certain number retain an interest in religion; but in isolation from the main stream of religious tradition, their religious life is bound to be starved, and their enthusiasm fitful. Perhaps they take up crank religions like New Thought, Spiritualism, or Christian Science, but these byways do not lead anywhere; and those who follow them get lost in a cultural desert.

If only our Church authorities could bring themselves to recognize the nature of the situation in which we are placed, and would boldly declare for freedom of thought *inside*, and not only *outside*, the Church, they would open up the way for a spiritual revival. It cannot be too often repeated that revivals come through individuals, and, in the case of religion, through the type of individual who at present finds the creed fence absolutely insuperable.

CRITICISM AND CHRISTOLOGY*

THE FINAL STAGE.

By the Rev. R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt., Vicar of Four Oaks, Warwickshire.

NEW Testament Criticism has entered on its final stage: the dry bones have begun to live. The critic lays aside his magnifying glass and rises with the fervour of the prophet. And 'Criticism integrated with Evangelism' belongs to the order of things creative: it will go down to history as the hallmark of the religious revival of the twentieth century.

What has happened to bring about this *dénouement*?

First, with regard to Textual Criticism. Canon Streeter has established, what was previously suspected, that there is no almost impeccable Codex whose readings when arrived at can dethrone all others. Instead of the Westcott-Hort idea of a Neutral BN, we have different families of MSS. emanating from the historic Sees of Ancient Christendom, the beliefs, the in-

* A paper read to the clergy of the King's Norton Rural Deanery.

tutions, the liturgical practices of which have left their dividual mark upon the family records. A bias, for example, one group of MSS. can now be discounted by its absence from other, and almost every verse—of the Gospels especially—s thus to be *weighed* to ascertain its most probable reading. formidable task, indeed, but the study is no longer a meticu-us, dreary *counting* of documents to see what reading has the ghest numerical support: it is related organically to the life d devotion of Christians, whose Churches in some cases are ll living, though some survive only in a name.

Behind the living Churches which preserved these records still earlier Churches, which, though as yet they possessed written records, had their institutions, their customs, and eir Gospel in an oral form. The Gospel after the tradition of ntioch is enshrined for us in what is now the *Gospel according St. Matthew*: that of Rome in what is now the *Gospel accord-g to St. Mark*: that of Corinth in the *Gospel according to St. uke*: that of Ephesus in the *Gospel according to St. John.* n we get behind these written records, influenced as they are the Spirit of the Age which produced them, to that primitive al preaching and teaching which came from the mouths of the postles and the first Evangelists? The most recent Literary d Historical Criticism is sure that we can.

Some will smile at such a question. Their answer will be t the Gospels as they stand, from beginning to end, represent e primitive teaching of the Church about its Lord. I am not aling, however, with such dogmatic assertions, since most ew Testament scholars would agree that doctrinal develop-nt is already apparent in the Gospels themselves. With re-rd to the Fourth Gospel, for example, the only vital question r us to-day is whether history constitutes so much as the point *departure* for its philosophic theologizing. Like St. Matthew d St. Luke the writer of the Fourth Gospel may have had me special source of value which cannot lightly be set aside: may even once have been a personal disciple of our Lord. t the fact remains that on a number of points of history he is such serious conflict with St. Mark that both cannot be right. ave not the facts, in his persuasive interpretation of them to a reek society and culture, been distorted even more than is monstrably the case in the use of *St. Mark* by St. Matthew

and St. Luke? At any rate, the *Second* Gospel it is which, since the Weiss-Holtzmann controversy in the middle of the nineteenth century, has come to be regarded as the *fons et origo* of Gospel history. Scholars have made this Gospel a vantage ground on which to put exponents of the Christ-Myth theory to flight. The latest, the most succinct, and most convincing statement of the argument was that presented by Dr. Major in 1925 in his *Jesus by an Eye-witness*, in which the historicity is demonstrated by elucidating the gradual unfolding in the Gospel of our Lord's Messiahship and the stages in the action of the story; stages in every case non-obvious and beyond the invention of Christians with experience only of the Risen Lord.

Yet it must be confessed that this type of apologetic has its drawbacks. The Jesus whose historicity is thus demonstrated is a fully human figure whom Matthew, Luke, and John present in heightened miraculous settings. So far the picture is clear and cogent. Unfortunately it is confused by St. Mark himself. The *Wunder* element in his Gospel is small, but it is loud. Those therefore who have elected to take their stand on *Mark* as history, in order to disprove the Christ-Myth theory, have been logically compelled—often against the grain—to accept as part of that history the stories of the Transfiguration, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Blasting of the Fig Tree, and the Gadarene Swine.

Some scholars, particularly in Germany, have grown impatient at this deadlock. Harnack and his school for example reduce the Essence of Christianity to the *Teaching* of our Lord, to such propositions about God and the soul as commend themselves to us as true by intuition. The self-authenticating power of these luminous propositions is then used to cut off, as unnecessary and unhistorical accretions, the Gospel presentations of Christ not only as a miraculous Being but even as the Messiah. Schweitzer, on the other hand, thinks He did claim to be Messiah, but was deluded. Loisy goes one better, and asserts that even if He was deluded, His delusions do not matter: the Essence of Christianity is the Faith of the Catholic Church. However, the more patient and cautious attitude of English scholars like Dr. Major has at length been rewarded, for *we can now get behind Mark.*

I am not referring to *Q*, for though *Q* is invaluable in supplementing *Mark* and is probably older, representing as Canon Crum thinks *The Original Jerusalem Gospel*, yet, where they overlap, both in teaching and order, *Mark* on the whole is to be preferred.[1]

Nor do I refer to *Proto-Luke*, Canon Streeter's Original Caesarean Gospel, which, even if it existed, is open to a similar objection.[2]

I refer to the last child of New Testament criticism, *Formgeschichte*, i.e. Form-History, associated in the first place, I believe, with Professor B. W. Bacon, more widely known as the special study of Martin Dibelius, and finally overhauled in brilliant and penetrating fashion by Professor Easton of the New York Theological Seminary. Form-Criticism is the study of various literary forms which take shape by dint of constant oral repetition: it has been transferred from the profane to the sacred sphere in an effort to reach the various forms in which Christian preaching and teaching were first given. The Gospels are no longer to be studied as a whole, but in the sections or units which compose them, units which it is claimed set forth in easily memorizable form the different aspects of the Christian message. Thus, we have sermon outlines of our Lord Himself, homilies, grouped round a text or kernel saying, whose poetic form can partly be recovered, as Dr. Burney has shown, by rules of Aramaic poetry. Parables are sermon illustrations. Sometimes the kernel sayings carry with them actual history, as when Jesus asked to see the tribute money. Sometimes the scenes are ideal reconstructions by the disciples, a telescoping of times and places on which Jesus taught the same or similar things. Again, we have Christian apologetic, in schemes or paradigms consisting of a positive statement, an argument from prophecy, and an

[1] *Cf.* the statement that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven *men*, an intelligible idea which Q contradicts, adding that those who say a word against *The Son of Man* shall never be forgiven. See Ch. IX of Canon Crum's book for further illustrations.

[2] *E.g., Proto-Luke's*, unlike *Mark's*, account of the Rejection at Nazareth *commences* the Ministry, although it has references to Jesus' previous public work. It also, to suit S. Luke's theory of the birth at Bethlehem, gets rid of S. Mark's reference to Nazareth as Jesus' 'native place,' substituting 'where he had been brought up,' though the whole incident turns on the point that a prophet is without honour in his birthplace.

exhortation to repentance, as frequently in *Acts*. Lastly, we have myths and legends. But every unit must be tested on its own merits. The important thing to bear in mind, as Dr. Bacon points out, is that when these paragraphs or cycles of paragraphs came to be incorporated in Gospels, more or less as we have them to-day, they were not transcribed for purposes of critical history, but for aetiological and evangelistic purposes. St. Mark, for example, no less than St. Luke, would desire to impart to those for whom he wrote 'certainty concerning the things wherein they had been instructed': he would also desire to defend the beliefs and practices of the contemporary Church of Rome; as would St. Matthew those of Antioch, St. Luke those of Corinth, St. John those of Ephesus. Particularly, the Christological views of these writers would be superimposed upon the form-units which they had received. We are apt to forget that the Churches were creative, and that their thought of Jesus, while His Spirit burned within them, could not stand still. This, then, is what I mean when I say that literary and historical criticism is now permeated with Christian Evangelism. *The Churches were preaching the Divinity of Christ as the result of their experience of His Risen Spirit, and they were finding inadequate, in consequence, the form-units handed down to them.*

Here, at last, is the explanation of the contradiction which runs through Mark, and makes Liberal Protestantism unconvincing. The Evangelist was recording under protest the Messianic claims and the development of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus as something so much *less* about his Lord than he himself was preaching. *But he was recording them.*[3] The authority of the sources which he had received prevented his doing more than adding to, and incidentally contradicting, them by the more explicit testimony to Jesus' Godhead which comes say from the Shechinah on the Mount of Transfiguration. If I may here record a difficulty of my own, it has always seemed inconclusive to insist that, in the Markan story, the Voice from Heaven and the Descent of the Spirit on our Lord at His Baptism are psychological experiences known to Himself alone;

[3] Admirably shown by Dr. Easton in *The Gospel before the Gospels*, Ch. VI.

hen the similar accompaniments of the Transfiguration are lainly recorded by the same writer as observed facts. The ystery is now solved: the first is history, the second Christ- logical theory: the first is fact, the second interpretation.

We arrive then at the point that Mark's reverence for his ources, even when they cut across his own Christology, pro- laims them to represent historical fact. It has often been sug- ested, for example, that the 'they' of many Markan stories hould be transposed, as it readily admits of being, into a very ivid 'we,' presumably St. Peter's. The picture of our Lord hus obtained from Form-Criticism is the non-miraculous pic- ure of the great Prophet and Teacher who claimed to be Mes- iah, but it is arrived at now by genuine critical means, and not n the *a priori* ground that miracles are impossible.

The Jesus of history then! Fully human! The best and visest of men! The Prophet of the Kingdom of God! Is this here we stop? No! We have to consider what this means. The istorical fact demands an interpretation. It has demanded one rom the beginning. It demanded one from Jesus Himself, for t the heart of His message is the conviction that it is with Him- elf that the Kingdom has come. He has a sense of vocation, f uniqueness, which He interprets as election to the highest ffice known to the thought of His time—Messiahship.

The disciples too felt the sacredness of His Person Who ad no will but the Divine behest: they also came to regard Him as *Messiah*; in the Lucan words, as 'a man approved by God' for that office, and 'anointed' thereto at His Baptism by he Holy Ghost (*Acts* ii, 22).

The preaching of Jesus as *Messiah*, however, lacked appeal n the Gentile world, ignorant as it was of such terminology. The value which He had for the Evangelists—the highest value hat they knew—justified them therefore in speaking of Him to foreigners in terms of the highest values that *they* knew. Thus, he point of view preached by the Synoptists themselves is re- presented not by the expression *Messiah*, but by *Son of God*; nd that of St. Paul and St. John by *Logos*. But these are inter- pretations only, which for their clearer enunciation were em- broidered with the myths and legends appropriate to such con- cepts. The method was legitimate enough, but it is time we

recognized that use was made of it, and what that use involved. For us, Jesus can be neither *The Messiah*, nor *The Son of God*, nor *The Logos*, for such terms are evacuated of all meaning to-day. Nevertheless, the successive phases of doctrine which they crystallize have a deep significance for us. They point the way to the Church's formulation of a *new* Christology in terms that we can understand, and in *modern* thought-categories.

This, then, is the point where the critic puts away his magnifying glass and becomes an Evangelist. With 'a torn and tattered Gospel of Mark in his hands,' as Schweitzer says derisively, he has, nevertheless, just the right framework on which to shape a Gospel fully adequate to the complex needs of our present time. The rest of his armoury is experience, the experience with which earlier evangelists filled their portraits in, the experience of living in the Kingdom of which Jesus is Lord. That Kingdom we speak of to-day in categories of a Triad of Values, as the Kingdom of the Good, the Beautiful, the True.

Philosophers are ready to admit that these qualities represent the truth about the universe. But only Jesus unlocks the gates of their deepest significance. *He* treats them as the sublime nature of the Father, and His response to them is so sincere that as they radiate from Him they glow with the sacred, too. We feel the distance between Him and ourselves, and worship. But only because He is fully human is He thus Divine: there is nothing 'reduced' about this Jesus of the critics. Their story of what He said and did may be sketchy, but it is enough to conjure up before the eyes of those who would be like Him a blurred picture of what He must have been. That picture becomes crystallized and living because, as one has said, He answers and fulfils 'all sorts of vague impressions, fleeting glimpses of the highest and best way to meet life, half-solved problems waiting for exactly the solution He indicates, joys which we could not quite understand, moral aspirations which we could not quite satisfy.'[4]

We shall, then, each fill in the picture as our present inner experience enables; and keep on filling it in as we learn more about Him by doing His Will. Our Jesus will thus satisfy at seven and again at seventy. He Who has been the Way, the

[4] H. H. Farmer in *The Modern Churchman*, January, 1927. The whole article is worthy of careful study: it has helped me greatly.

uth, the Life, for me so far, will I know be sufficient when I me to the deepest, darkest shadow. In the heights above, or the depths beneath, Jesus, I find, has always been there first. eneath His picture in my heart a Saint has taught me to write e word, *Adequate*. Or if you would like it in a verse, one of arles Wesley's sums it up :

Jesu, my all in all Thou art,
My Rest in toil, my Ease in pain,
The Medicine of my broken heart,
In war my Peace, in loss my Gain,
My smile beneath the tyrant's frown,
In shame, my Glory and my Crown.

REFLECTIONS OF A NEW ZEALAND COUNTRY CLERGYMAN

By the Rev. Noel F. Benham, Vicar of Hampden, N.Z.

DURING the last few days I have heard a repetition of that almost moth-eaten query, 'Why take up church-work in colonies, when there are so many souls to be saved at home England?' We may hope that the recent World Call will ve supplied an adequate answer to that question, but perhaps ew reflections on the work of a clergyman in one of the most pular of our colonies may do something to prove the need it exists for Spirit-filled men to do Church work in the more tant lands overseas. It is only fair that I should point out the introduction to this article that I have only had experience Church work in the south of the South Island of New Zealand, that what I say may not be entirely applicable to work in ner parts of this Dominion, or, far less, to work in other parts the Colonies.

Let me indicate first of all the advantages which the life of a ntry clergyman in New Zealand has to offer. As most people ow, New Zealand is a most delightful country, with one of most congenial climates in the world : there are seldom ex- mes of temperature in either winter or summer, except in ly parts the winters are always mild, and we very seldom see ow except on the mountains. The weather in summer is very e that in the south of England, with considerably more sun- ne and practically no dull days. New Zealand has been led the 'Tourist's Paradise,' and this is no exaggeration :

the scenery is magnificent, the Cold Lakes District of Otago i a paradise in itself, the coastline is largely rugged and beautifu and fish abound in both the many rivers and the sea. Th natural beauty of this country alone is a very strong argumen in favour of taking up work here.

But it is true that the clergyman should have more to do wit the people than with the place, however beautiful it may be, s let us now say a word about the New Zealanders. The firs thing that will probably strike a newcomer is the wonderfu hospitality of the people of this land. This has been remarke on so many times, that there is little need to say much here But it is a great advantage for a clergyman to receive a kindl welcome wherever he goes in his parish visiting. Not only wil the people give him a ready welcome when he visits their homes but they will also give generous support to any scheme that h has in hand if they consider it to be a good one. The writer ha frequently been surprised by the acts of generosity performe by the people of his parish, for in many cases they are not i affluent circumstances; but there seems to be a tradition in Ne Zealand, 'always give to the Church.'

Then also life in the colonies is attractive by reason of it freedom—the contrast between the crowded slums of a grea English town and the open spaces of the New Zealand country side is a very marked one. The struggle for existence seems t be far less acute in this beautiful land than it is in England There is far less of that terrible bug-bear, class-distinction, an there is little or no acute poverty. Life is lived under less arti ficial conditions, with the result that there is greater happines among the people. There is a very charming brotherly spiri between the members of the different churches in these country districts. If the Presbyterians run a flower-show the Anglicans support it; if the Anglicans have a bazaar the Roman Catholic are there in force, and so on. It seems as if we were nearer t Church Reunion in New Zealand than in many other places, an maybe the Colonial Churches will yet give a lead to the Churche of the Motherland in this direction.

But Church work in New Zealand does not lie entirely on a bed of roses, and it is only right that we should consider som of the disappointing features about a clergyman's work here a

ell as the happier ones. As a clergyman settles down to his ork here he will probably be saddened by the fact that in many ases the people seem to be lacking in any deep religious sense r in any abiding spirituality. They are kind and good-natured a fault, but the deep wonder of the Christian Faith seems ften to be denied to them. It is difficult enough in England to et people to 'talk religion,' but it is a thousand times more ifficult in this fair land. It is intensely difficult to make them ealize that God can make a vital appeal to them, and that the cceptance of Christianity implies conversion. Perhaps this is artly due to the inadequate buildings in which the worship of od is frequently carried on. It is not easy to be inspired or spiring in an ugly schoolroom full of the paraphernalia of the eek's teaching. And even the churches are often not very elpful: they are usually little wooden buildings, draughty in inter and hot in summer, with no pretensions at architectural eauty. We all know that the worship of God does not depend n beautiful buildings, but only those of us who have to do ithout them can fully realize what a help they may be. Then ne monotony of preaching to tiny congregations may damp the rdour of even an initially keen clergyman—it is so difficult to ake the services of God what they should be with about twenty eople in the church, very few of whom can sing. The New ealand clergyman often feels a great longing to hear once again church service really beautifully rendered in one of the great hurches of the Homeland.

A New Zealand author, in the preface to one of his works, eferred to this country as a 'bookless land.' And this is unfor-unately largely the case. The clergyman who is a lover of great iterature and a true student will find himself largely starved in country vicarage here. The New Zealanders are not, as a rule, reat readers; they are often far too busy, and there are prac-ically no really good lending libraries. This fact may have pro-luced the intellectual barrenness which is sometimes credited o the colonial clergy.

These have been random jottings, but they may do some-hing to create interest in the Church-work in this country, not nly by showing its advantages, but by showing the other side s well; if so, they will have achieved their purpose.

THOUGHTS ON REUNION

By the Rev. Roy McKay, M.A.

IN discussing the various methods and plans for the reunion of the Christian Churches and the problems raised thereby, we are in danger of forgetting the object for which reunion itself is desired. That object is to make the Church of Christ a more effective instrument for bringing in the Kingdom of God and a better expression of what we believe that Kingdom to be. We are told that the Churches lack power and force and spiritual energy to-day because they are disunited and divided. Lack of unity is said to be the cause of an ineffective Church. Are not those who say this reversing the true order of things? The truth would rather seem to be that the Churches are divided because they lack life and spiritual power. Unity is a fruit of the spirit, not the spirit a fruit of unity.

An analogy will help to illustrate this point. During the war we achieved a national unity which surpassed the expectation of our own leaders as well as that of the enemy. Men and women were found to be at one in thought and purpose because they were dominated by a common idea. This idea is summed up in the word Patriotism. The idea of England, and what they believed England to stand for, created in them a new source of power and enthusiasm which itself brought unity. However unbalanced we may now know this idea of Patriotism to have been, here was something outside ourselves which, having penetrated into our hearts and minds, awakened in us a life and energy which was the real cause of our unity.

The attempt to climb Mount Everest furnishes another example of the same principle. Here too there was unity of a high order. But this unity was not achieved through the desire of the members of the expedition to work together for a common end. It was in the first place and fundamentally throughout the fruit of something from outside themselves. We may call that something the passion of the mountain climber. No one can read the life of Mallory without realizing that the idea of climbing Mount Everest had a power over him which was compelling.

was not a matter of his aspiring to the idea, but of the idea aspiring, overpowering and compelling him. It was he that was the servant, the unscaled mountain the master.

If this is a true account of the situation, then it would seem that unity comes as the result of a *dominant spiritual idea*. The measure of the unity thus attained depends upon the degree of spirituality of which the idea itself is capable.

The dominant spiritual idea of religion is the idea of God. Where this is weak we shall not expect to find spiritual energy. There is nothing to create it. Nor shall we find any real unity of those claiming to be religious. That is the point. This seems to be our present situation. There is no dominant spiritual idea of God in the Churches to-day. In the final analysis nothing issues more clearly from the Prayer Book controversy than the fact that failure to reach any real agreement as to the forms of worship to be used was due to there being no real agreement as to the idea of the God who was to be worshipped. The plea raised for allowing a variety of forms of worship, though supposed to be an indication of liberal-mindedness, was often only a cloak for hiding this fundamental weakness.

The present-day habit of despising *doctrine* and *theology* is similarly an evasion of the whole problem. For doctrine means fundamentally a dominant spiritual idea of God. No more and no less. What is needed to-day is not less doctrine, nor simplified doctrine, nor even up-to-date doctrine, but an effective doctrine. No amount of tinkering with the machinery of the Church, which is really driven by the power of doctrine, will make it more efficient if that power itself is weak. In this the Church resembles an electric power station. It is endeavouring at the moment to supply current over a wider area. The cables are being laid. At the power station we are overhauling our machinery, putting in new turbines and bigger boilers, and in the midst of these activities we forget that the current can only be generated by power from outside, by water and coal. Neither of these are man-made.

Until the Church has a message of God which is not merely a message *about* God but a message *from* God, there is little hope of that new spiritual energy which creates unity. It may not be entirely fanciful to compare the coming Lambeth Con-

ference with the Council held at Jerusalem as recorded by Luke in the fifteenth chapter of the *Acts*. The points at issue between the various Churches to-day are not very different from the problems facing the early Church. Our present concern, however, is not with the questions to be decided either then or now, but with the way in which the decision was and can be reached. Peter made it clear in his speech to the Council that the Gentiles had received the gift of the Holy Spirit when they had heard the *word* from him. 'God made choice . . . that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe' (*Acts* xv, 7).

The reference is to Peter's preaching to the household of Cornelius which is recorded in *Acts* x, 44, 45. 'While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word.' The essential point is that it was their *hearing of the word* which set free the power of the Spirit. The *word* was the new dominant spiritual idea of God created by God's anointing of Jesus and His raising Him from the dead (*Acts* x, 36-43). This compelling doctrine of God gave the power and spiritual energy which created unity between Jew and Gentile. It is just this word of God that we seem to be without to-day. Without it all schemes for reunion are only improvements in the machinery.

Why does so much discussion to-day centre round the seat of authority in religion? Because no existing authority speaks with the compelling voice of God. The existing authorities, Church, Bible, and individual conscience, though claimed as genuine authorities, are really only props to a tumbling building. The only compelling authority is the word of God unmistakably heard. To this our ears seem to be deaf.

The Churches to-day are like different climbing parties ascending by self-made paths a mountain whose summit is wrapped in mist. We may agree, if we like, that one path is better than another, or we may sit down to a conference to decide to try and make a new path, but neither process kindles any enthusiasm for climbing in the hearts of the mountaineers. The only thing that will do that is a vision of the summit and of the sun shining on the snow-capped peak. But who can clear away the mist? 'With man it is impossible, but with God all

ngs are possible.' Maybe if we can train ourselves to look into the mist we shall create that expectancy without which our side it seems God never acts. At least so doing we shall t miss the splendour of the sight when God shall roll away e mist.

Our first need is to realize our need. 'If way to the Better ere be it exacts a full look at the Worst.' We shall not make y progress until we have the courage of despair and acknowdge that the mist is there. Indeed there are signs, the only peful ones, that some of the mountaineers are growing tired path-finding and path-making.

BOOK REVIEWS

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM ONCE MORE*

I.

Mr. Stewart, a Presbyterian and Professor of Philosophy in a Canadian iversity, has written a sympathetic account of Anglo-Catholicism. He s written well and attractively, though his knowledge and judgment ver reach the level of Dr. Brilioth, or even of the Wesleyan Dr. Rigg, mention two other students of this development of the English Church o have not themselves been Anglicans. Occasionally Mr. Stewart kes slips. The poem on Gunpowder Plot (p. 105) did not appear in *e Christian Year* in 1827; it was added in the third edition, in 1828. It not in St. Luke but in St. Matthew that the Baptismal formula is scribed (p. 213). The Malines Conference Report was not issued before t first debate on the Prayer Book in the House of Commons (p. 341). e revenues of the Church of England can hardly be said to be provided ractically by a tax' (p. 377). The 'Composite Book' is not an accepted nonym for the Revised Prayer Book of 1927/8 (p. 361).

Moreover, Mr. Stewart betrays a greater unfamiliarity with Anglicanism an is permissible to one who writes a book about it. He apparently nks that the Athanasian Creed is recited at the Altar (p. 76), that Conucation was active in the reign of George IV (p. 87), that diocesan conrences are synods (p. 169), and are dominated by Anglo-Catholics (p. v), at Anglo-Catholics celebrate the Eucharist only once a week (p. 313), at Anglicans as a condition of ordination make a statement that implies at they reject any doctrine of the Real Presence (p. 314), that the rank d file of the Church was in accord with the proposed Prayer Book of 27/8 (p. 358), that Bishop Barnes shares with Sir William Joynsonicks the belief that an Anglican priest is primarily a State official (p. 371). r. Stewart knows the Church of England from books and newspapers. e is like those converts to Rome who annoy born Roman Catholics by eir passion for rigid logical orthodoxy. It is probable that seventy per nt. of church-going Anglicans have no idea what the Oxford Movement

* *A Century of Anglo-Catholicism*. By Herbert Leslie Stewart. (London: Dent & ns, 1929. Price 10/6.)

moved, and a still higher percentage, even after the Prayer Book controversy, have only the dimmest notion of what Reservation is.

This does not mean that Mr. Stewart is unfair, or that his account of Anglo-Catholicism is misleading. It does mean that he is inclined to misread the position by accepting as Anglo-Catholics the general bulk of High Churchmen, the majority of whom have never faced the first principles of Catholicism, and in any real crisis are unlikely to be more than critical neutrals.

The strength of Catholicism in the Church of England is not in numbers, but in a grasp of principles and a steady adherence to those principles. It is that disinterested devotion to first principles that attracts to the Oxford Movement many of us who feel with Mark Pattison that the principles themselves are vicious.

II.

The Oxford Movement began in a quest for stability in an atmosphere of unrest. Catholic Emancipation (1829), the Reform Bill (1832) and the suppression of ten Irish Bishoprics, insignificant in their results as they appear to-day, were hailed as signs of the impending overthrow of the things that made for public safety. Keble's sermon on *National Apostasy* at St. Mary's, Oxford, on 14th July, 1833, sounded to the Church the rallying cry that Newman took up in the Tracts in the following September. It was a call to the Church to bestir itself—in the cause of reaction, it is true—but still a call to self-examination and revival. Examples of the degradation of religion at the period have been multiplied, perhaps with exaggeration. Two features, however, were beyond all question. Where religion was above the average it had no intellectual appeal. Of Wesley's preaching Coleridge said that it was marked by an 'entire absence and unsusceptibility of ideas,' and Anglican Evangelicalism was only Wesleyanism within the borders of the Establishment. Elsewhere, the level was worldly and unreal. Most of the clergy, being unable temperamentally to reproduce the emotions implied in the Evangelical outlook, and being unaware of any other vital form of Christianity, lost heart, and were content to be just the official good man, country gentlemen who conducted the Sunday service. The purpose of the Tracts was to give to these last a religion of reality and intellectual appeal. The first was found in putting into operation what was implied in the Church's formularies and in the ministerial office, the second in research into the past in order to fix the traditional principles that priest and prayer book enshrined.

The essence of the Oxford Movement lay in a theory of Authority. It held that Authority is embodied in the Divine Society. In the Society, the Church, the Divine functions mechanically through right organization and correct formulae. It does not make itself felt by its own moral beauty or by its own spiritual power; it is not tested primarily by its fruits. The Church and the Sacraments are the normal channels of the Divine energy. The method by which the original Tractarians upheld this system was research into the past to enable them to interpret the message and use of the Prayer Book by the light of Christian tradition. In the course of a century this system remains unaltered. The true Anglo-Catholic to-day stands in principle where Newman and Pusey stood. The method of interpretation, however, has widely changed. The appeal to the past is now designated 'British Museum Religion'; the appeal is made instead to the living mind of Western Christianity, a phrase which discreetly covers the practices and teaching of Rome.

III.

In contradistinction to the Catholic view, it might be urged that the Divine actually functions, not in this mechanical way, but through living agents who seek to be its instruments. J. R. Mott used to be fond of saying that religion is primarily a matter of the Will. It is the good will of the individual, priest or layman, that produces that reaching out to the Divine that makes any system of religion effective. The effectiveness of Catholic and Protestant alike depends not on any inherent rightness of method, but on the personal readiness of the agent to submit himself to the Divine. That, however, was not a view that Newman could have entertained. His conception of man's relationship to God was dominated by fear. In 1823, he noted that man by nature is a foe of God or the object of God's wrath. In 1833, he conjectured that a fever he had caught in Sicily was a punishment for travelling on a Sunday.

Though on analysis Anglo-Catholicism appears anti-rational, nevertheless Reason and Truth have been fundamental to the whole movement. Newman, led by the one and seeking the other, passed over to Rome in 1845. Yet says Mr. Stewart, 'If Anglo-Catholicism had remained in that sphere of abstract speculation with which it began, the early excitement would soon have died away' (p. 173). That may be so. But actually the issue still lies in that sphere of speculation. Newman's departure was followed by the operative or Ritual period. It is significant that when the Oxford Movement drifted into this stage it ceased to be productive of literature, of outstanding men, of any but parochial effects. It became important again in 1889, when *Lux Mundi* brought it back to the publicity of ideas. It has become still more important in the last twenty years, because the mass of Englishmen have caught up, where in 1833, for lack of education, they had no contact with the Movement.

IV.

Meanwhile, the effect on the Church of England had, not wholly, perhaps, but mainly, been good. Idealization of the past produced many eccentric and some foolish developments. One of the least satisfactory was the concentration of attention on mediaeval architecture to the impoverishment of native ideals. This has made the conventional type of English church a building entirely unsuited to a country with a damp climate and subdued sunshine. The Gothic church is almost impossible to warm and light, and often it is acoustically defective. In minor matters, as in the attempt to belittle the greatest discovery in English religious technique, the Anglican chant, the appeal to the past has often been foolish. On the other hand, the concept of the Church as a Divine Society, which is the key to Newman's position, has been of the greatest value. It has uplifted English worship and English religious thought to an atmosphere of dignity they probably never reached before. The good taste, scholarship and sanity of Newman and his friends have left a mark on every section of our Church, and have obliterated both the sentimental emotionalism of the Evangelical Revival and the smug respectability of the High and Dry Orthodox. Newman had not a great mind like Wycliffe, but his limitations brought him nearer to the average cultured Englishman.

What has profoundly modified the Catholic movement is an ultimate loyalty to Reason which goes back to Newman. Followers have hesitated and protested, but the march of Reason has never left Anglo-Catholicism far behind. In 1889, *Lux Mundi* accepted the principle of Biblical criti-

cism that Newman had condemned in Milman and the Anglo-Catholic world had execrated in Colenso. Liddon might lament the disloyalty to the Lord, who had quoted the Old Testament as the Word of God. He might declare that the Athanasian Creed stood between him and renunciation of the ministry. He might affirm the predictive value of the Old Testament. The Die Hards stood with Liddon, but the tide still went down. The principle accepted against the traditional reading of the Old Testament was bound to reach the New. Bishop Gore, with a splendid inconsistency, holds out against it, but a casual glance through the *New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1928) shows his associates already deserting him, while *Essays, Catholic and Critical* (1926) have gone the two miles with the critic who compelled them to go one.

It is true that groups of the Catholic body continue to stand aloof, coteries to whom Bishop Gore is a back number and Archdeacon Rawlinson little better than a rationalist. But they cannot hold the receding tide. Mr. Stewart's view is that this reactionary and immobile section makes the bulk of the movement. That view is open to serious doubt. The Catholic Movement has, throughout its history, been a quest for Truth. It has learnt in that quest that Truth has seldom a static quality:

'Time makes ancient good uncouth.'

The Modern Churchman is an unpopular figure in Mr. Stewart's pages. He is warned that toleration of other people's extravagances is the only justification for his own. But even the Modern Churchman believes that Truth has bounds, and that it is only Error that has none. The Anglo-Catholic asks for submission to an external authority which may be visualised as the Episcopacy, but in fact proves to be no individual bishop but dim episcopal figures reflecting the mind of Western Christendom. The Modern Churchman asks for submission to a moral internal authority, which will progressively and co-operatively reveal Truth. It is the first who cannot tolerate the second, nor can he admit his own status in the Church to be merely permissive. To the Catholic Catholicism alone is the Church. It is that logical intransigeance that the more stubborn Anglo-Catholicism maintains. At the same time, the educated leaders do not stand by it. The Catholicism of the *Church Times* makes most noise, but it is the Catholicism of *Theology* that counts, because it alone has survival value. The best men of all schools to-day are capable of larger and higher views than their predecessors. It is inconceivable, for example, that any group to-day would be led into the futility of the Non-Jurors. Dr. Sykes has aptly shown that the internal comprehensiveness of the Church of England, its reasonableness and its cautious *via media* between Rome and Geneva have been fashioned not by logic but by the Erastian character of the English Reformation Settlement and the consequent adaptability of the Church. This is clear to men of all outlooks. 'Defiance of Parliament,' the phrase with which Mr. Stewart concludes his survey, is the phrase not of the Church but of politics. It is the idea of Lord Birkenhead, not of any serious Anglo-Catholic.

V.

Among the gains of the Catholic Movement, some have been inclined to place the vitalizing of social ideals in the Church. It will be agreed on all sides that many Catholics have not only worked for social amelioration in their parishes, but have appealed for social righteousness on a larger platform. But it cannot be claimed that this is a fruit of Catholicism.

Newman himself was without social realism. His *Sermons on Subjects of the Day,* preached between 1838 and 1840, never refer even obliquely to the real subjects of the day, Chartism, the Irish Famine, the abolition of Slavery on British soil. Social zeal had no roots in the principles of the Movement; it broke in at an angle, and it was only with the *Lux Mundi* group that from the doctrine of the Incarnation there came to be constructed a theology of social reform, and it owed more to Maurice than to Pusey. From 1850 the demands of social life upon Christianity have been felt by every type of English Christian. The most active of all Christian social teachers have been found in Non-conformity. In the defence of the black man the pioneer was the despised Colenso, and in the civilizing of the native races it was the Evangelical Church Missionary Society that took the lead.

This hundred years of Catholic development has provided many correctives to our English Christianity. Perhaps the corrective it continues to need is to realise what Newman at least grasped, that Truth and Righteousness are more necessary than Life and Liberty. It is better to find the clergy arguing about the Eucharist than about stipends, even as Christianity is more evident in the picture of Parliament discussing the Prayer Book than in that of the National Church Assembly debating the pulling down of churches and the provision of pensions for Archdeacons.

E. J. Martin.

ROUSSEAU.*

The present age owes its mentality more to Rousseau than to any other single man. Yet there has hitherto been no book in English to tell us exactly what he intended to teach. He taught, as everyone knows, 'A return to Nature'; but what did he mean by this? Did he believe that animal desire is our only guide? Is he asking us, with Saint-Lambert, to raise our glasses to 'The return to Nature and the morals of Otaheite'? Or did he wish us to believe that nature is all one for man and brute—*i.e.*, that we and they are mere automata? Or did he mean that the only way to be natural is to be a savage, or to remain an infant?

Those who call him a 'poisonous sentimentalist' probably hold that Rousseau meant one or other of these things. But what he asked for was that man should keep faith with his own primal nature, and not grow up deformed like a pollarded tree. And, if this sounds like a commonplace, we should pause to consider that we nearly always act upon an opposite hypothesis of man's nature. 'Deep down in most of our hearts lurks a conviction that the nature of man is more or less desperately wicked, and that the aim of all our art is to rescue him from natural iniquity. For many a prophet and philosopher has told us this.' Schoolmasters, priests, policemen, speak with one voice.

This doctrine of Original Sin is frankly regarded by Rousseau as a barbarous delusion, and there is no denying that, if he is right, the foundation of Catholic and Protestant orthodoxy alike has been withdrawn, and it is only a question of time for the whole fabric to tumble into ruin. For the traditional theological *schema* is based upon a particular belief about man, *i.e.*, that he is 'fallen,' and needs supernatural, miraculous redemption. But what need is there for this if man can attain his destiny by natural growth, assisted by rational art, like an oak tree? What need of supernatural revelations, sacraments, interpositions, and so on? Man can get on without them.

* *The Meaning of Rousseau.* By Ernest Hunter Wright. (Oxford University Press. 8/6.)

'Where is the natural man? He may be the naked savage, or he may be any later man in whom reason has kept the elemental sentiments intact, while the unnatural man will be one in whom they have been distorted or suppressed. It may possibly be better to be any sort of natural man, however rude, than an unnatural one, however cultivated; better to be an ignorant savage than a perverted philosopher. Ignorance is preferable to error. But that is not the only choice; it is infinitely better to be the final natural man than to be the earliest, to be a true philosopher rather than a barbarian.'

So it turns out that the natural man of Rousseau's admiration is not a savage. Rather he is Cato; or, rather, he is the kind of man that Cato tried to be. To try to be that man is the nature of us all, if we will let it grow aright. This is what is involved in Rousseau's social, educational and religious teaching; it is found in the *Social Contract,* in *Émile* and in the *Savoyard Vicar.* Mr. Hunter Wright treats his subject under the successive heads, the Natural Man, the Natural Education, the Natural Society, the Natural Religion, and his book is emphatically one of the most interesting — on any subject — that we have read for a long time. Rousseau, in some respects, may have been an unpleasant man, but he had ideas, and was a prophet. The man who wrote the *Vicar* knew something about religion from inside. His 'natural religion' was not the creed either of a sentimentalist or a savage. 'It may come to men only when they have reached a certain stage of reason and experience; it is the latest of religions to develop and the heir of all the others; it is still waiting for more reason and experience to perfect it; once more, the natural man is not our brute forbear, but the last man that we are travelling on to be.' J.C.H.

CHRISTOLOGY AND CONTEMPORARY THOUGHT.*

This large book of nearly five hundred pages is for the most part a doctrinal treatise. The author defines it as 'an essay concerning the doctrine of the Incarnation in its relation to organic conceptions': its interest lies in the fact that it attempts to state and defend the doctrine of the Incarnation in terms of a philosophy of the world and of experience. That philosophy and the terminology employed is heavily and openly indebted to the writings of Professors Alexander, Lord Morgan and Whitehead. 'The organic conception of the universe' is one which Mr. Thornton believes to be 'of the utmost importance for the theology of the Incarnation.' Briefly, it is that the universe, as a developing series of events, reveals 'a hierarchy of grades and values' in its scheme. The book is written from the standpoint of Christian Theism, for which 'creation must mean something very much more significant than it can ever become in an interpretation which confines itself to an evolutionary scheme' (p. 35). 'At every stage in the ascending series of the universe there is an entry of creative activity and an "emergence" of new factors and conditions which are the products of that activity' (p. 44). Man stands at the summit of the ascending series; but 'a radically false step would be taken at this point if we assumed, in face of all the evidence, that there is a sharp discontinuity between the spiritual aspects of human nature and the system of physical events which underlie man's bodily constitution' (p. 44). In the order of reality to which mental life belongs

* *The Incarnate Lord.* By Lionel Spencer Thornton, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection. (Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd. Price 21/-)

an finds himself confronted with ultimate values and with standards reference which transcend all other levels of his experience' (p. 56). s 'hierarchy of grades and values' Mr. Thornton regards as the pro- ssive 'incorporation' into the cosmic series of 'the eternal order' ich God embraces in Himself) which is the ground and the final goal he whole evolutionary scheme. 'To an organic and developing universe respond organic and developing wholes of experience. But both pre- pose an eternal order or reality underlying their relative unities' (p.). So it is that the organic conception of the universe, with its back- und of eternity, is not only compatible with a religious interpretation, belief in such an evolutionary scheme and in a transcendent Theism necessary the one to the other. Such is the argument of the first tion of the book, and it is both interesting and valuable.

Mr. Thornton then turns from human religious experience in general he specific experience embodied in the New Testament. This also he mpts to explicate in the light of 'organic conceptions,' and the final pters attempt the same for the doctrine of the Trinity. His definition the organism by reference to a principle of unity controlling and nscending plurality, enables him to see in the doctrine of the Trinity complete harmony of that unity and plurality which is but partially n in the various grades of the evolutionary process. Similarly, the arnation is the final 'incorporation' of God into the world; Christ h completes the lines of development tending towards His final revela- , and is the 'new creation,' the embodiment of 'the Kingdom.' Con- uently, the complete revelation of God is to be found in Christ, in om are the sources of the world's redemption, and in whom the cosmic es finds its completion; 'Christ, as the embodiment of the Kingdom God, which brings the eternal order to adequate incorporation in history, Himself the actuality of God embodied and incorporated into history' 213).

If the arguments of Mr. Thornton's book can be substantiated, there o doubt of its importance as a contribution to the understanding, with aid of modern conceptions, of the central Christian doctrine; and, in e of unnecessary length due to repetition and recapitulation, and also e irrelevance and a not infrequent obscurity, the book maintains its rest. In my judgment, the argument, while yielding not a little which f value, fails at the vital points.

(1) Mr. Thornton nowhere treats at all fully of the relation subsisting ween the eternal order and the created world. On the one hand, the mic series has a *nisus* towards the eternal order, so that 'the organic es finds its significance in its passage towards an eternal order which beyond itself' (p. 77): on the other hand, the eternal order, or God, ncreasingly incorporated into the cosmic series. It is, then, of the hest importance that we should know the exact meaning of the word corporation' which Mr. Thornton so frequently uses, and, further, t we should know what such 'incorporation' involves for the meta- sical status of a created world which increasingly incorporates the rnal order. The book contains no adequate treatment of these points.

(2) In dealing with the Incarnation, the point which is important in lf, and in this book, is the nature of the relation of Christ to man to the creative process. In Mr. Thornton's study we are handicapped lack of adequate treatment of the created world's status in reality, and further by the fact that the argument which deals with the relation of rist to the creative process is by no means clear, and seems occasionally

to lapse into mere assertion. It is clear that if the universe is an ascendin series of 'grades' and values, distinguished throughout by the 'eme gence' of what is genuinely new, then the higher grade can never b adequately explained in terms of the lower. Consequently, it is natura that Mr. Thornton cannot regard the human grade as adequate to explai Christ, who, unlike man, *completely* embodies the eternal order. So fa the reasoning may be justified. But Mr. Thornton desires more than this his argument 'can find no place for the mediator of an absolute revelation except his metaphysical status be altogether beyond the organic series an on the level of the eternal order' (p. 260). 'Whilst the Incarnation is i line with the ascending curve of creative activity, it is not simply a con tinuation of that curve. The Christ whom Christians worship as God i not a product of creative activity' (p. 226f). Jesus Christ stands withi the succession of history, 'but He entered it from beyond.' It seem clear, then, that for Mr. Thornton, while there is no discontinuity betwee the spiritual aspects and the physical events of human nature, *the In carnation does involve a discontinuity*. What he fails to do is to sho that such a conception of the Incarnation is consistent with, or in any rea relation to, 'the organic conception of the universe.' Moreover, it is b no means clear to us that Mr. Thornton's conception of the Incarnatio is either necessary, or in organic relation to his own argument. Of *ma* he says: 'Incarnate spirit or embodied mind is here subject to the sam general conditions as are found to govern the series as a whole' (p. 44). The human organism reaches down into the cosmic series, but it als reaches up beyond it into the eternal order, or God' (p. 56). And note 'it is impossible to exaggerate the transcendent "beyondness" of thi eternal order as it is given to our experience,' yet 'the fact that it *is* give to our experience shows us clearly that it has an immanent as well as transcendent aspect' (p. 56f). Further, 'The new cannot properly speak ing emerge out of an existing situation. It may appear as thus emerging but it must enter from beyond' (p. 84), and the 'beyondness' or 'othe ness' characteristic of the eternal order could never have any meaning fo us unless it were incorporated into our experience and into the series t which we belong (p. 77). These quotations and summaries are writte with reference to the spiritual experience of man in general. Christ, then it would appear, in Mr. Thornton's view, must enter our series from eve beyond the 'beyondness' (which 'it is impossible to exaggerate'), whic is characteristic of the eternal order as it is incorporated into our experi ence. If 'with man we stand at the summit of the ascending series, wher the progression of the universe and its modes of revelation and meditatio can apparently advance no further,' why cannot Christ be regarded as th continuation and completion of the divine creative activity? If, in as fa as the divine creative activity can be manifested or incorporated into finite process, *discontinuity* occurs with Christ, how can we know it, seein that, according to Mr. Thornton, 'the three spheres of creation, revelatio and redemption' are 'interlocked in our experience through a *definit continuity*' (italics mine) 'in the structure of that experience' (p. 262) This objection has the greater force because Mr. Thornton admits that th meaning of the 'beyondness' or 'otherness' of the eternal order coul never be known to us unless it were incorporated into our experience an into the series to which we belong (p. 77).

If we mistake not, it is because Mr. Thornton cannot free himself fro the haunting ghost of an *a priori* theoretical finality that he feels compelle to regard Christ as discontinuous with the organic series in some sense i

ch the emerging higher grades are not. Thus, 'if we regard Him as uman individual within the organic series in whom there is a unique ifestation of the eternal order, then we have no ground for supposing Christianity has the final character which Christians have ever found t' (p. 259). But what is the criterion by which we know that 'in ist we have an absolute revelation to which in principle nothing can be ed'? Mr. Thornton asserts that it is *not* that there is no other channel evelation, and that it is *not* that all revelation is locked in the past, ' it does mean that in Christ is the clue to the significance of all other ns of revelation' (p. 259). Two observations may be made:

1) It is precisely because, and only so long as, Christ is found to be clue to the significance of all other forms of revelation that there is ground for regarding his as even the unique manifestation of the eternal r. Only such a value-judgment can create the necessity for any istology, and so long as Christ is found to provide such a 'clue,' his lation is final in the only sense in which experience can know finality. , in art and in truth, we seem to find finality within the cosmic series, out supposing it to 'enter from beyond' in any other sense than all rporation of the eternal order into the creative process is from beyond.

2) The ghost of a theoretical finality is a bugbear to theological ight. Until a fuller revelation than that of Christ may come, we do need the theory, while if conceivably such a fuller revelation should e, no theory of the finality of Christ's revelation would survive it. it might hinder it. It seems to us that Mr. Thornton's conception he Incarnation is unnecessary in itself and out of relation with the ganic conceptions' in which he sets out to interpret it. And there is further question as to whether a *complete incorporation* of the eternal r is possible within a finite world. Experience may know a unique ifestation, but that such a manifestation is *complete* is at best a pre- ous inference from experience, unnecessary to it and productive only nsoluble problems.

J. S. Bezzant.

A PHILOSOPHER ON REUNION.*

Leibniz is probably the most encyclopaedic mind that the Modern rld has produced. The extent of his knowledge was colossal. He an expert in mathematics, physics, law, economics, theology, history, aphysics, among other subjects. And he was no mere collector of s. Behind his unbounded and ever-increasing store of knowledge, e was a deeply original and constructive mind which impressed its racter on all that it touched. In all of the spheres just mentioned, bniz made contributions of permanent importance, and outside the ain of scholarship he constantly suggested and sometimes carried ugh practical proposals of great significance. To take one instance llustrate that he was not simply a theorist, he devised a scheme for is XIV to invade Egypt, and drew up a detailed plan of campaign for armies, and this plan was so closely similar to that adopted later by oleon that it was at one time supposed, no doubt, gratuitously, that oleon was actually indebted to Leibniz for his own.

Unfortunately for later scholars, Leibniz never wrote a complete osition of his philosophy. He left behind countless letters, papers, tises (some of which are only now beginning to be published). Con- ently, it has been the privilege of subsequent scholars to gather up

* *The Reunion of the Churches. A Study of G. W. Leibnitz and his Great Attempt.* G. J. Jordan, D.D., D.Litt. (London: Constable, 1927. Price 12/6.)

the fragments that remain, and to construct the system, which, as far as is known, Leibniz himself never committed to paper. Scholars have not been slow to attempt this task, but hardly any two scholars are found to have come to the same conclusion. Within the last three decades, there have been written from fifteen to twenty treatises devoted to Leibniz, each of them professing to depict the 'true' Leibniz, and to show wherein his interests culminated. But scarcely a single pair of these agree in their main points, still less in matters of detail. Mr. Bertrand Russell and M. Couturat, both mathematicians, discover that Leibniz subordinated everything to mathematics; Troeltsch, the philosopher of religion, finds in him primarily a modern mystic; the older interpreters, who were mainly metaphysicians (*e.g.*, Kuno Fischer), had seen in Leibniz first and foremost a metaphysician, and so on.

One of the most recent interpretations is quite new. Dr. Jordan sees Leibniz from yet another angle. He would have us believe that his interests culminated in neither politics nor physics, nor metaphysics, nor mathematics, but in a scheme for the reunion of Protestantism and Catholicism. The Thirty Years' War had finally divided the Christian world of Germany into two sharply separated bodies, and religious reunion could clearly be won now only by the method of mutual agreement. The horrors of a disunited Christendom seemed hardly less grevious to Leibniz than they do to the Anglican episcopate when assembled at Lambeth. And, in order to remedy the disastrous state of affairs, Leibniz entered into correspondence with Bossuet, and succeeded in producing a formula to which both Catholics and Protestants could subscribe without scruples. When it came to giving practical effect to these proposals, difficulties certainly arose. It was Lyons and Ferrara-Florence over again. But it was a heroic attempt.

Dr. Jordan's volume is a careful study in this enterprise of Leibniz. It is packed with information, and is a book which no student of Leibniz can neglect. Moreover, it throws much interesting light on the ecclesiastical history of the Seventeenth Century. But to speak of Leibniz' efforts in the direction of reunion as 'the work which was dearest to his heart' (Preface, p. vi) appears to us to be a gross exaggeration. Leibniz may have been considerably influenced by this motive. His rejection of the Cartesian doctrine of substance as *res extensa* may have been determined, at least, partly, by the fact that Descartes' view could not be reconciled either with the Roman doctrine of Transsubstantiation or with the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation. But it is hard, particularly for anyone who has studied Leibniz' correspondence as a whole, to believe that his central interests did not go deeper than the sphere of ecclesiastical politics.

F. L. Cross.

AN ANTHOLOGY.*

'The compilers of this anthology believe that it may be useful at the present time to bring together a collection of passages designed to illustrate the essential unity of religious, philosophic and poetic thought as expressed in ancient and modern literature.' So say the compilers of this well-chosen and suggestive anthology in their Preface. Many people dislike every species of anthology, as superficial, casual and tending to substitute cursory for concentrated attention in reading. But if readers of this book are made acquainted with authors and ideas of which previously they were ignorant, its publication has been abundantly worth while.

* *The Tree of Life.* By V. de S. Pinto and G. Neill Wright. (Constable & Co. 8/6.)